STATE OF VERMONT PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

DOCKET NUMBER 7970

PETITION OF VERMONT GAS SYSTEMS, INC.,
REQUESTING A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC GOOD,
PURSUANT TO 30 V.S.A. SECTION 248,
AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE "ADDISON
NATURAL GAS PROJECT" CONSISTING OF
APPROXIMATELY 43 MILES OF NEW NATURAL GAS
TRANSMISSION PIPELINE IN CHITTENDEN AND
ADDISON COUNTIES, APPROXIMATELY 5 MILES OF
NEW DISTRIBUTION MAINLINES IN ADDISON
COUNTY, TOGETHER WITH THREE NEW GATE
STATIONS IN WILLISTON, NEW HAVEN AND
MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT --

September 16, 2013 9:30 a.m.

100 State Street Montpelier, Vermont

Technical Hearing held before the Vermont Public Service Board, at the Montpelier Room, Capitol Plaza Hotel, 100 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont, on September 16, 2013, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

PRESENT

BOARD MEMBERS:

James Volz, Chairman

David C. Coen John D. Burke

STAFF:

George E. Young, Policy Director June E. Tierney, General Counsel Donald M. Kreis, Staff Attorney Jay E. Dudley, Utilities Analyst

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.
P.O. BOX 329

BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05402-0329 (802/800) 863-6067

EMAIL: info@capitolcourtreporters.com CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863 6067

25

,	Page 4]
1		
2	Also present:	
3	Charlotte Ancel, VGS Jane Palmer, Pro Se	
4	T.J. Poor, DPS George Nagle, DPS	
5	Tamera Pariseau, DPS Katie Durdy, Legal Intern	
6	Peter W. Lind, VELCO Jean-Marc Teixeira, VGS	
7	Mr. LaForce, VGS John Heintz, VGS Jim Howe, VGS	
8	Charles Pughe, VGS Jeffrey Nelson, VGS	
9	Allison Stone, DRM Danielle Changala, DRM	
10	Danielle Changala, Divi	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	CADITOI COMPT DEDODUEDO INC	
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863 6067	

,			Page 5
1	INDEX		
		D	
2	Witness	Page	
3	A. Donald Gilbert, Jr.	1 /	
4	Direct Examination by Ms. Hayden Prefiled Testimony	14 16	
4	Cross Examination by Ms. Levine	17 , 68	
5	Cross Examination by Mr. Saudek	27 , 73	
	Stephen J. Wark	•	
6	Direct Examination by Ms. Hayden	77	
	Prefiled Testimony	80	
7	Eileen Simollardes	0.6	
8	Direct Examination by Ms. Hayden Prefiled Testimony	86 91	
	Prefiled Testimony of Timothy S. Lyons	93	
9	Cross Examination by Ms. Levine	124,240	
	Cross Examination by Mr. Saudek	129,245	
10	Cross Examination by Mr. Lougee	134	
	Cross Examination by Mr. Diamond	135	
11	Cross Examination by Mr. Sciarrotta	143	
12	Cross Examination by Mr. Palmer Cross Examination by Ms. Porter	145 160 , 247	
12	Kris Hammer	100,247	
13	Direct Examination by Ms. Egan	249	
	Prefiled Testimony	250	
14	Eugene A. Guilford, Jr.		
4 -	Direct Examination by Mr. Saudek	255	
15	Prefiled Testimony	256	
16	Cross Examination by Ms. Hayden Cross Examination by Mr. Palmer	257 , 269 263	
10	James B. Howe	200	
17	Direct Examination by Ms. Hayden	273	
	Prefiled Testimony	275	
18	Cross Examination by Mr. Palmer	283	
1.0	Redirect Examination by Ms. Hayden	284	
19	Tyler Miller - Affidavit and Prefiled	287	
20		- 1 - 1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
0.1	Exhibit	Admitted	
21	ADG 1-3 CLF-1	16 17	
22	CLF Cross-2	26	
	Petitioner's SJW-1 through 4.18	80	
23	Supp. SJW-1 through 11	80	
	Petitioner's EMS-1 and 2	90	
24	Petitioner's Reb. EMS-1 and 2	90	
25	TSL-1.1 through TSL-10	93 138	
2.5	SP-2 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	130	
	(800/802) 863-6067		

	Page	e 6
1		
2	INDEX CONTINUED	
3	Exhibit Page	
4	Board-1 240 ACRPS Supp. TB-2 246	
5	Petitioner's Supp. EMS-1 246	
6	VFDA EAG-1 through 4 255,272 Petitioner's Cross VFDA-1 through 11 259	
7	Petitioner's Cross VFDA-15 and 19 263 JBH-1 through 3 275 Petitioner's Reb. JBH-1 275	
8	Tyler Miller Exhibits 287	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	
	(800/802) 863-6067	

	Page 8
1	in the Economics Division; and Tamera
2	Pariseau, the Chief of our Consumer Affairs
3	Division.
4	MS. LEVINE: Sandra Levine, Conservation
5	Law Foundation.
6	MS. DILLON: Judith Dillon on behalf of
7	Vermont Agency of Natural Resources.
8	MR. SAUDEK: Richard Saudek for the
9	Vermont Fuel Dealers Association.
10	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Need to use the mic if
11	you can or speak up. And does the
12	Department have a mic? I think we would
13	like to get one for them.
14	MR. SAUDEK: Richard Saudek for the
15	Vermont Fuel Dealers Association. And my
16	client isn't here right now, but he will be
17	here soon I expect.
18	MR. COEN: Is your mic working, Mr.
19	Saudek?
20	MR. SAUDEK: I think it is.
21	MR. COEN: Please speak into it next
22	time, okay?
23	MR. PETERSON: Richard Peterson on
24	behalf of the Vermont Land Trust. No one
25	present with me at the moment. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

1 my wife Jane. 2 Kimberly Hayden on behalf MS. HAYDEN: 3 of the Petitioner Vermont Gas Systems. With me is Mr. Gilbert, Ms. Simollardes, Mr. 5 Wark, Mr. Teixeira, all of whom are witnesses of Vermont Gas. Mr. LaForce is 6 7 also here. He's a Vermont Gas engineer; 8 John Heintz is behind me. He's one of the 9 witnesses. And Jeffrey Nelson was here, he 10 has been in the room. He will be here 11 today. 12 We also have Charlotte Ancel from Vermont Gas, and there are two associates in 13 14 the back of the room from Downs, Rachlin & 15 Martin that are observing this; Allison 16 Stone and Danielle Changala. C-H-A-N-G-A-L 17 -A. 18 MR. BURKE: We can hear you Ms. Hayden,

but you should speak into it.

MS. HAYDEN: Also Jim Howe, who has also prefiled testimony on behalf of Vermont Gas is sitting behind me, and Charles Pughe of Vermont Gas is here. And he's in the very back of the room. He has not filed testimony. He's the Project Manager. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. Thank you. As far as the microphones go, except for just now, most of the time we'll be needing a microphone for us, the witness, and whoever is doing the cross examination. So make sure when it's your turn to do cross examination that you have a microphone lined up for yourself and that you actually use it.

A couple other preliminary matters. If you want an Internet connection in this room you should talk to the hotel, the front desk. You can pay for it and they will provide you with one. I don't know, I think it's like 10 or 12 dollars a day, something like that. The fee to us to provide it for everyone was too great and we couldn't justify that.

Also, parking; if you need parking here there may be passes available. You should also check with the front desk at the hotel and you may be able to get a parking pass.

Otherwise I think now the main concern is the schedule of witnesses. As I understand it we are going to hear from Don CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Gilbert, Steven Wark, then Eileen

Simollardes. We have rearranged the order

that was originally proposed in a previous

filing. Followed by John Heintz, Jean-Marc

Teixeira, and then Eugene Guilford. And if

there is time, we would like to try to fit

in Vermont Housing Board's witness Hammer

and Vermont Gas Systems witness Howe. So

today.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We would also like to talk a little bit about the witnesses for whom no one had cross examination and therefore they are not on the schedule yet. We would like it if the party -- we are going to have some questions for most almost all of them. So not too extensive, but some questions. they are going to need to come. We should be able to allow one or two of them -- we will let you know as soon as we have figured that out -- we haven't figured that out yet. For now you assume they all should come. you folks would talk among yourselves about when to fit them in, that would be useful to us. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

that's who we are going to be hearing from

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

- 1 A. DONALD GILBERT, JR.
- 2 Having been duly sworn, testified
- 3 as follows:
- 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 6 Q. Good morning, Mr. Gilbert. Can you please
- 7 state your name for the record?
- 8 A. My name's Don Gilbert.
- 9 Q. And your occupation?
- 10 A. I'm the President and CEO of Vermont Gas
- 11 Systems.
- 12 Q. And do you have in front of you a document
- 13 entitled "Prefiled Testimony of A. Donald Gilbert, Jr. on
- 14 behalf of Vermont Gas Systems dated December 20"?
- 15 A. Yes, I do.
- 16 Q. And that document was prepared by you or under
- 17 your direct supervision; is that correct?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. And it consists of 19 pages of text; correct?
- 20 A. I believe so.
- 21 Q. Are there any corrections that you need to
- 22 make to this testimony at this time?
- 23 A. The -- line 15, I'm sorry, page 15 line one,
- 24 in my December 20, 2012 testimony we had an estimate of
- 25 cost of the project of 84 million. We have had -- Mr. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Heintz I believe has testified on February 28 and updated
- 2 that. The current projection is 86.6.
- We have had some additional work, we have been
- 4 working on settlements with a number of parties that push
- 5 the costs a little bit further, but Ms. Simollardes and
- 6 Mr. Heintz will be able to speak to that directly.
- 7 Q. And Mr. Gilbert, you also beginning on page 15
- 8 and continuing on to page 16 referred to a number of
- 9 witnesses including Mr. Lyons?
- 10 A. Yes. Mr. Lyons is no longer with Vermont Gas
- 11 and Ms. Simollardes will sponsor his testimony. She is
- 12 the Project Director now taking responsibility for the
- 13 project. Has changed a little bit from what we had
- 14 before. And we have also had Charles Pughe who is acting
- 15 as the overall Project Manager.
- 16 O. And with these corrections and clarifications
- 17 is your testimony true and accurate to the best of your
- 18 knowledge and belief?
- 19 A. Yes, it is.
- 20 Q. And you also have in front of you three
- 21 exhibits that were prefiled on December 20, marked as
- 22 exhibit Petitioner ADG-1, ADG-2 and ADG-3?
- 23 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And were those prepared by you or under your
- 25 direct supervision?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Yes, they were.
- 2 Q. Are there any corrections you need to make at
- 3 this time?
- 4 A. No. Other than to note I think Ms.
- 5 Simollardes has further information on the overall
- 6 competitive position, but they are correct and accurate as
- 7 of the testimony.
- 8 Q. Okay. And so they are true and accurate to
- 9 the best of your knowledge and belief with that
- 10 clarification?
- 11 A. Yes.
- MS. HAYDEN: I move the admission of the
- 13 prefiled testimony and exhibits of Don
- 14 Gilbert.
- 15 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
- 16 (No response.)
- 17 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. They are
- 18 admitted.
- 19 (Exhibits marked ADG-1, ADG-2 and ADG-3
- 20 were admitted into the record.)
- 21 (The Prefiled Testimony of A. Donald
- Gilbert, Jr., was admitted into the record.)

23

24

25

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

- 1 reduce Vermont's greenhouse gas emissions, and on page six
- 2 lines one through five you address the transportation
- 3 sector. Do you have that in front of you?
- 4 A. I do.
- 5 Q. As part of this proceeding Vermont Gas Systems
- 6 has not provided any specific analysis of the conversion
- 7 of the transportation fleet to natural gas; is that
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. We have not.
- 10 Q. And on page three of your testimony, lines 18
- 11 through 20, you note that a major increase in the North
- 12 American supply of natural gas has driven natural gas
- 13 prices down while the prices of alternative fuels like oil
- 14 and propane have continued to increase; do you see that?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. And do you agree that the use of hydraulic
- 17 fracturing in the past few years has reduced the price and
- increased the supply of natural gas?
- 19 A. I think we have seen hydraulic fracturing
- 20 increase the supply of natural gas, oil and propane.
- 21 Q. Has it also reduced the price in recent years?
- 22 A. Yes, it has.
- 23 Q. And hydraulic fracturing for gas is not
- 24 allowed in Vermont; is that correct?
- 25 A. I don't know the details. I know that the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 legislature had a law regarding that. I don't know the
- 2 exact details of that. But the fact is that there really
- 3 wasn't shale gas to develop in the state. So I wasn't
- 4 focused on it.
- 5 Q. Do you not know whether hydraulic fracturing
- 6 for gas is allowed in Vermont?
- 7 A. I'm not sure of the exact details of what that
- 8 law says.
- 9 Q. Do you agree that a portion of the supply that
- 10 would be used by the Addison Natural Gas Project if it is
- 11 approved would come from sources that use hydraulic
- 12 fracturing?
- 13 A. I think it's likely.
- 14 Q. And would Vermont Gas agree to a condition
- 15 that it not use gas from sources that use hydraulic
- 16 fracturing?
- 17 A. I don't think that would be in the best
- 18 interests of our customers.
- 19 O. So is the answer no?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. And does Vermont Gas Systems have an
- 22 Alternative Regulation Plan?
- 23 A. We do.
- Q. And in very general terms does that plan
- 25 decouple or separate the profits from the volume of sales CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 of Vermont Gas?
- 2 A. I'm not sure if it specifically -- the plan
- 3 has done that. We have always said that we do not make
- 4 money from the sale of the commodity. So I believe we
- 5 have had that even before alternative regulation.
- 6 Q. Okay. So in light of that, in general terms
- 7 more of the Vermont Gas profit comes from the
- 8 infrastructure that's in place or the pipes in the ground
- 9 rather than from the sale of the cubic feet of gas; is
- 10 that correct?
- 11 A. We are allowed to earn a return on the
- 12 investment we make in our system, yes.
- 13 Q. So all other things being equal, if you sell
- 14 the same volume of gas through smaller infrastructure you
- 15 make less money.
- 16 A. I believe that's accurate.
- 17 Q. On pages 10 to 11 of your testimony, you
- 18 address the portion of the project that includes quote;
- 19 incremental facilities required to serve the Ticonderoga
- 20 Mill that are part of this project; is that correct?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. And serving the Ticonderoga Mill is not part
- of the petition in this proceeding; is that correct?
- 24 A. Well it's related because we have included a
- 25 portion of the investment that would be required to serve CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 the Mill, or it could be used for Rutland in the first
- 2 phase. So it is related to this and a portion of it.
- 3 Q. You're not asking for approval today from the
- 4 Board to serve the -- to serve the Ticonderoga Mill; is
- 5 that correct?
- 6 A. Not specifically to serve the Mill. But for
- 7 the facilities that would be related to it.
- 8 Q. And if Vermont Gas chooses to pursue serving
- 9 the Ticonderoga Mill, you would come back to the Board
- 10 with an additional request?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. But some of the pipes in the overall
- 13 infrastructure are larger in this phase of the proceeding
- 14 than they would otherwise be just to serve Middlebury; is
- 15 that correct?
- 16 A. Yes. I think Ms. Simollardes' testimony
- 17 addresses that. She explains that it made more sense to
- 18 include those pipes, the larger, longer pipe in
- 19 anticipation of Ticonderoga rather than to build a pipe
- 20 and then come back and have to replace it.
- 21 Q. But those -- those facilities or the size at
- 22 least of those facilities is not needed to serve
- 23 Middlebury; is that correct?
- 24 A. It's needed to serve future load that we see
- 25 even if we did not have Ticonderoga.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. And can you identify the analysis of the
- 2 future load to serve existing companies -- the analysis of
- 3 the future load that you're referring to? I don't recall
- 4 that in the testimony that Vermont Gas Systems filed.
- 5 A. I think probably best talk to Eileen
- 6 Simollardes about -- the project director. It was
- 7 developed as we looked at that, we recognized the
- 8 potential to eventually serve Rutland.
- 9 Q. So then it is not to serve load to Middlebury
- 10 or just to Middlebury which is what the request today is
- 11 for.
- 12 A. No. The request today is a combination. We
- 13 are asking for approval of the expansion into Addison
- 14 County serving several towns including Middlebury. But
- 15 also the inclusion of a larger, longer pipe in
- 16 anticipation of future loads.
- 17 Q. Is it fair to say then that you're asking for
- 18 approval from this Board for facilities to serve customers
- 19 that you're not presently asking to serve?
- 20 A. Do you want to repeat that? I'm not sure I
- 21 followed that.
- 22 Q. Are you asking for approval today to enable
- 23 Vermont Gas to serve customers in Rutland as well as
- 24 Ticonderoga?
- A. We are not asking specifically for approval of CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 service to Ticonderoga today.
- Q. What about Rutland?
- A. Nor Rutland.
- 4 Q. The facilities that you are asking for
- 5 approval for today include infrastructure for a future
- 6 expansion that's not currently before the Board; is that
- 7 correct?
- 8 A. Let me be clear. When we build our pipeline
- 9 system whether it be transmission/distribution, we look
- 10 out in the future and see what's coming at us. I'll give
- 11 you an example.
- 12 Years ago with Williston as we developed a
- 13 pipeline we actually put in a large pipe that was needed
- 14 for the immediate load in anticipation of the future load.
- 15 So this is consistent with this. And it's a way to do it
- 16 in a manner that is much more efficient rather than come
- 17 back in after we build service just for the specific load
- 18 at the time, and having to put in additional facilities
- 19 not that much longer afterwards.
- 20 Q. So Vermont Gas reasonably anticipates the
- 21 future use of the capacity of that pipeline over the next
- 22 20 to 50 years?
- 23 A. We do. When we looked at the potential for
- 24 expanding natural gas in the state, we saw that 50 percent
- of our population resided from the border down to Rutland. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 We looked at the potential for expanding the pipeline and
- 2 felt there were 16,500 customers in that corridor that we
- 3 could serve. So yes we are developing this in
- 4 anticipation of future development of service in the
- 5 state.
- 6 Q. And your testimony addresses some of the
- 7 claimed environmental benefits of this proposed project.
- 8 I would like to address some of the concerns that
- 9 Conservation Law Foundation and some other environmental
- 10 organizations have raised regarding this project.
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. Vermont Gas Systems established an advisory
- 13 group process that Mr. Wark discussed in his testimony; is
- 14 that correct?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. And you supported and approved the development
- 17 of that process; correct?
- 18 A. Yes. It was part of it.
- 19 Q. And one goal of that process was, as Mr. Wark
- 20 describes, to identify significant issues as early in the
- 21 process as possible; is that correct?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. And in general Vermont Gas Systems used the
- 24 advisory group process to inform Vermont Gas Systems'
- 25 decision making regarding this project?

 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

- 1 A. In general.
- Q. And the process occurred from roughly January
- 3 through April of 2012?
- 4 A. I believe those are the correct dates.
- 5 Q. And Conservation Law Foundation was an active
- 6 participant in the process, attending three of the four
- 7 meetings that were held; is that correct?
- 8 A. I believe that's correct.
- 9 Q. And Vermont Public Interest Research Group and
- 10 Vermont Natural -- Vermont Natural Resources Council were
- also participants in the process; correct?
- 12 A. I think they were invited. I don't know how
- 13 often they participated.
- Q. Okay. Do you have before you what's been
- 15 marked as CLF-Cross-2?
- 16 A. I do.
- 17 Q. And do you recognize that as a letter to Don
- 18 Gilbert, Conservation Law Foundation, Vermont Natural
- 19 Resources Council, Vermont Public Interest Research Group
- 20 dated April 24, 2012?
- 21 A. I do.
- 22 Q. Have you seen this letter before?
- 23 A. I have.
- Q. And do you agree that it was received by you
- 25 within a few days of the 24th of April? CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. I don't remember exactly when it was received,
- 2 but I remember seeing it.
- 3 O. About that time frame?
- 4 A. I assume so. I don't know. You have to check
- 5 and see when it actually -- it was time stamped in our
- 6 office.
- 7 Q. Okay. And to the extent Vermont Gas Systems
- 8 used the advisory group process to inform the petition it
- 9 filed, it would have also considered the issues raised in
- 10 this letter; correct?
- 11 A. The letter actually came after the conclusion
- of the process, but I certainly looked at it and
- 13 appreciated the advice.
- 14 MS. LEVINE: I would like to offer
- 15 CLF-Cross-2 as an exhibit.
- 16 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
- MS. HAYDEN: No objection.
- 18 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: It's admitted.
- 19 (Exhibit CLF-Cross-2 was
- admitted into the record.)
- 21 BY MS. LEVINE:
- Q. And Vermont Gas Systems has not proposed any
- 23 limitations on the use of gas in the pipeline, for
- instance, only to replace oil or gas or not to be used for
- 25 a new generating facility; is that correct? CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. We don't restrict the service to our
- 2 customers.
- 3 Q. And similarly Vermont Gas Systems has not
- 4 provide -- proposed any limitation regarding time frame
- 5 for the use of the gas in the pipeline?
- 6 A. Limitations on time frame? Can you explain?
- 7 Q. Time. Yes. Any limitations that the facility
- 8 would no longer be needed or anticipated to be used 50
- 9 years from now.
- 10 A. No. We have not.
- 11 Q. And would Vermont Gas Systems agree to a
- 12 condition that would limit the use of the gas delivered in
- 13 this pipeline either in terms of use or in terms of time?
- 14 A. Again I don't think that would be in the best
- interests of our customers. So I would not.
- 16 Q. Thank you. That's all I have.
- 17 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Mr. Saudek,
- I think you're the next person who signed up
- 19 for cross.
- 20 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 21 BY MR. SAUDEK:
- 22 Q. Hi.
- A. Hi, Mr. Saudek.
- Q. I would like to go back to the beginning with
- 25 Ms. Levine. That was quite a drop that the price of CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 natural gas took in about 2008; wasn't it?
- 2 A. It wasn't just 2008. We started to see it
- 3 turn in that time frame, but it continued to track down.
- Q. Can you -- it went to about what; a third or a
- 5 quarter of the price that it had been; is that right?
- A. You know, this is subject to my memory, but I
- 7 think we had, back in the 2008 to 2000 time frame, they
- 8 had been seeing it drop to about 20 percent where natural
- 9 gas was 20 percent less than oil, fuel oil. I'm not sure
- 10 what it was with propane.
- 11 We have seen up where we are now over 40
- 12 percent less than fuel oil.
- 13 Q. But at that time around coming up to 2008, the
- 14 price of natural gas was in the range of about 12 to 13
- 15 dollars, was it not?
- 16 A. I'm not sure the specific price. I would have
- 17 to check.
- 18 Q. You don't remember that it was in that range?
- 19 A. I don't know the specific price back at that
- 20 time.
- Q. And were you running the company at that time?
- 22 A. I was.
- 23 O. It's now what; below four dollars; isn't it?
- 24 A. I believe that's correct.
- Q. What -- you talked generally about hydraulic CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 fracturing as a cause; is that correct, of this lower
- 2 price?
- 3 A. I think it contributed to the development of
- 4 production in the shale formations is what I think really
- 5 drove it. Hydraulic fracturing was part of the technology
- 6 that was used to develop that.
- 7 Q. Can -- this being an -- if you take my word
- 8 for the drop, and I wasn't running your company at the
- 9 time, can you -- that's quite a dramatic drop. Can you
- 10 give a little more precise reasons for it?
- 11 A. Precise reasons?
- 12 Q. Well did it have to do with regulation
- 13 perhaps?
- 14 A. I'm not sure what your question -- I'm not
- aware of a specific regulation that resulted in that drop.
- 16 Q. I'm thinking specifically regulation of
- 17 hydraulic fracturing.
- 18 A. Not that I'm aware of. Not from what I was
- 19 hearing and have heard since then in the industry. No.
- 20 I'm not aware of some regulation that changed it and
- 21 resulted in that drop.
- 22 Q. Are you aware that certain -- certain
- 23 processes and certain entities were exempted from
- 24 regulation over hydraulic fracturing by the federal
- 25 government?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-606/

- 1 A. You know, I've heard opponents say that. But
- 2 I've seen regulation at state and federal level that still
- 3 very much applies to hydraulic fracturing, and if
- 4 anything, I actually saw the development of tighter and
- 5 stricter regulations related to the hydraulic fracturing
- 6 back in that time frame.
- 7 Q. Are you aware that the EPA has said it will
- 8 issue a report on the subject of hydraulic fracturing and
- 9 its effects, various environmental effects, and that they
- 10 have set a target date of next year to issue that report?
- 11 A. I'm aware that the EPA has issued several
- 12 reports. One on questions about air and water quality,
- and I'm aware they continue to study it. Yes.
- 14 Q. But in particular they are planning, are they
- 15 not, a more comprehensive report on the subject that will
- 16 -- that will inform the public as to its effects, and they
- 17 have set as a target date 2014, is that not right?
- 18 A. I'm not sure about that date and specifically
- 19 what the plans are for report. I know they continue to
- 20 look at it. But again I think they have come out with
- 21 recent reports, so I'm more familiar with those than what
- 22 you're referring to.
- 23 Q. Don't you think that given the fact that this
- 24 subject is being intensively studied, studied, by the EPA
- 25 and elsewhere, and given the fact that it's been -- that CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 fracking has been banned in Vermont, and that other states
- 2 are looking at it, it makes sense to defer for say a
- 3 couple of years your project until we can all get a handle
- 4 on this?
- 5 MS. HAYDEN: I'm going to object, and I
- 6 haven't objected up until now, but the issue
- of hydraulic fracturing, there is no
- 8 fracking that's being proposed in Vermont.
- 9 And based on the Vermont Supreme Court
- 10 ruling in the Hydro-Quebec case, this Board
- has jurisdiction to consider impacts outside
- of the state to the extent that there is a
- material impact within Vermont, so to the
- 14 extent that Mr. Saudek is referring to
- environmental impacts outside of Vermont,
- from our perspective, the only environmental
- 17 impact that could have the potential to have
- a material impact within the state is
- 19 relating to greenhouse gas emissions.
- 20 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Mr. Saudek?
- 21 MR. SAUDEK: Well my understanding this
- is a widely debated question, but my
- 23 understanding is that the hydraulic
- 24 fracturing in the processes of extraction do
- in fact contribute to greenhouse gas or at CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

least it's so far assumed that. And what

I'm trying to get at is whether it makes

sense to wait, as I said, make sense to wait

until we can get a little more answer on

that.

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: We are going to overrule the objection. We think this line of questioning also goes to economics and could be useful on that issue as well. So we are going to allow this to continue.

THE WITNESS: Can you read the question back please?

(The record was read as requested)

THE WITNESS: The answer would be no, and let me explain. We have seen hydraulic fracturing develop fairly recently certainly in the energy industry. But it's been a technology that has been used for decades in the water drilling industry, and has developed over time here, natural gas, and now we are seeing it for oil and propane.

I think there is a lot of study that has been done, in particular in Pennsylvania, we spent some time learning more about it

before we pursued this project. And I think CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

1 there has been a lot of thought put into it.

And I've seen around the country as I

3 attend industry conferences a lot of

interest in developing more. I've heard

places like North Carolina talking about

6 wanting to get into this. California has

defined the rules for it. So for Vermont to

8 deny Vermonters access to the lower price

9 and cleaner benefits of the gas that's now

being produced I don't think would be in the

best interest of the state or our customers.

12 BY MR. SAUDEK:

5

7

10

- Q. Would you agree that if hydraulic fracturing
- 14 is clamped down on by the government so that -- or the
- 15 legislatures, so that it goes back to the pre-2008 era in
- 16 terms of the techniques of extracting gas, your prices
- 17 would most likely go up?
- 18 A. Well I think the important thing is what the
- 19 competitive position is. And if, as you say, there were
- 20 some clamping down on fracking, I think it would affect
- 21 several fuels. And so it's hard to say what the relative
- 22 relationship would be, but I think it would affect the
- 23 price of oil, the price of propane as well. So it's hard
- 24 for me to say exactly what would happen if that were to be
- 25 the situation.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 34

- 1 Q. What about natural gas though? The likelihood
- 2 would be that it would go up; wouldn't it?
- 3 A. Could.
- Q. Could. Why didn't you in your testimony and
- 5 in your initial submittal of the company try to quantify
- 6 methane leaks going back upstream up the system?
- 7 A. Can you refer to where I did that in the
- 8 submittal?
- 9 Q. Well your numbers and Ms. Simollardes' numbers
- 10 are basically, as you say, I believe at the burner tip.
- 11 They are your pollution numbers that you originally gave
- 12 us. They are not life cycle; right?
- 13 A. In the original analysis we did a burner tip
- 14 analysis.
- 15 Q. Yeah. Why did you not at that time give us
- 16 your best estimate of leaks upstream, methane leaks
- 17 upstream on your delivery system?
- 18 A. Well I think the question you're asking me is
- 19 whether -- why we didn't do a life cycle analysis at that
- 20 time. Is that the question?
- 21 Q. Sure.
- 22 A. And we felt that there was enough analysis
- 23 already out there that people recognized natural gas was a
- 24 cleaner fuel than oil or propane or coal, and therefore we
- 25 didn't feel it was necessary. We felt that by looking at CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 the burner tip where the fuel was actually being used in
- Vermont was sufficient to establish some of the
- 3 significant economic -- or environmental benefits of
- 4 utilizing natural gas instead of fuel oil.
- 5 Q. You have seen various estimates and various
- 6 averaging and the attempt to -- attempts in prefiled by
- 7 these witnesses in this case to try to put a number on the
- 8 methane leaks upstream.
- 9 What number do you think makes sense? Is
- 10 there a percentage number that you would -- that you
- 11 believe makes sense?
- 12 A. Well I think we have addressed that in Joel
- 13 Bluestein's testimony in which he's gone through and done
- 14 a fuel life cycle analysis and taken into account any kind
- of emissions from the process on both sides, on the
- 16 production of natural gas and on the production of oil. I
- don't have a specific level, but I think if you look at
- 18 his testimony you'll see what the assumptions are that he
- 19 used in developing that.
- 20 Q. Okay. You don't -- yourself though you
- 21 haven't made your own inquiry into that.
- 22 A. No. What we do -- we focus on our system.
- 23 And Vermont Gas takes great pride in what we've done in
- 24 replacing the old bare steel and cast iron system. We
- 25 have a very tight system and a very low level of emissions CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 from that, but I haven't gone beyond that and tried to do
- 2 my own analysis of what the system is upstream of that. I
- 3 know that Joel Bluestein did his analysis taking that into
- 4 consideration.
- 5 Q. Given the methane contributes to global
- 6 warming, why don't I ask you; methane is a greenhouse gas,
- 7 isn't it?
- 8 A. I understand it is.
- 9 Q. Given that, don't you think it is reasonable
- 10 for the Board to take into account probable methane leaks
- on the lines that feed you right back up to the source?
- 12 A. Well as I said in the life cycle analysis, I
- 13 think it makes sense to look at the emissions from the
- 14 entire process when you do a life cycle on both sides.
- 15 Q. And if there are methane leaks they will
- 16 contribute to world greenhouse gas, right?
- 17 A. If there are leaks of methane, it could
- 18 contribute to, yes, it would. As from the reports that
- 19 I've seen.
- 20 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Mr. Saudek, by the way,
- you signed up for 10 minutes. You're now 16
- 22 minutes into your cross.
- 23 MR. SAUDEK: I have a few more.
- 24 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: That's fine.
- 25 BY MR. SAUDEK:

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

- 1 Q. I believe in response to Ms. Levine's
- 2 questioning you talked about-- you suggested in effect
- 3 that the infrastructure is basically where you receive
- 4 your return from the system; is that right? Is that a
- 5 fair --
- 6 A. That's fair.
- 7 Q. What do you pay -- just in MCF -- what do you
- 8 pay wholesale and what do you charge retail overall --
- 9 A. I don't have --
- 10 Q. -- today?
- 11 A. I don't have the specific price. You can ask
- 12 Ms. Simollardes who does both our rates and our supply and
- 13 get the specifics on that.
- MR. SAUDEK: Thank you. I have nothing
- 15 else.
- 16 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: All right. Thanks. You
- two are the only parties that signed up for
- 18 cross.
- I think we are up to the Board's
- 20 questions. Do you have questions? Or does
- Jay? Go ahead.
- MR. YOUNG: Morning, Mr. Gilbert.
- THE WITNESS: Good morning.
- MR. YOUNG: So let me just follow up on
- 25 the line that Mr. Saudek was just asking CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

you. He was getting at the potential
effects of changes in federal regulation of
hydraulic fracturing.

Has VGS -- I mean you've presented a cost/benefit analysis and a full economic analysis of this project. And I know it's through other witnesses. Have you looked at what the potential effects of that would be -- of changes in federal policy might be on your ability to get additional customers and therefore make the project cost effective?

THE WITNESS: No. We have not looked at potential change and how it would affect the customers.

MR. YOUNG: To your knowledge if there were say a 10 percent increase in the price of natural gas, let's just say because of hydro fracturing bans you have less gas available, would that affect the cost effectiveness?

THE WITNESS: I think it would. But I think we would still have a very strong competitive position even with that kind of increase. I guess the one thing I would say that I have looked at -- one of the things CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 39
1	that has been raised is there are potential
2	for the export of LNG to affect it. And
3	what I've seen is an analysis that doesn't
4	seem to even the projections I've seen
5	have any kind of significant effect.
6	MR. YOUNG: And by referring
7	basically you're are you inferring that
8	because there is enough gas supply where you
9	can export LNG, and therefore there is
10	enough of a buffer there that on the
11	supply side. I mean is that the logic train
12	that you're trying to get at by looking at
13	the LNG exports?
14	THE WITNESS: I haven't done the
15	analysis. But what I've seen in analysis is
16	even with the exports that are expected
17	there is sufficient supply that natural gas
18	prices will continue to be low and
19	competitive with the alternatives.
20	MR. YOUNG: And is it your expectation
21	that if supply started becoming constrained
22	the first thing that would go would be the
23	LNG exports so that
24	THE WITNESS: That's a reasonable

thought.

25

MR. YOUNG: Let me -- in your testimony

at page seven you talk about your recent

experience in Jericho.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: And you refer to some of the penetration rates you've seen there. Are you anticipating the same success in Middlebury? And just -- this may be redundant with some of the questions that I ask Ms. Simollardes that are coming in that way, and if they are, we can refer them -- refer me in her direction. But --

THE WITNESS: She will certainly want to address it as well. But let me just say we saw a pretty high level of penetration in Jericho. Actually surprised. We went in thinking we are going to get 200, 250 customers; we got 450. We have 600 customers today. A very high level of penetration. I don't think we have assumed that high level as we have developed it.

She can clarify. But one of the important things to recognize, and we have seen this as you go into a new area that isn't as familiar with natural gas you may CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

areas that currently have more natural gas

THE WITNESS: We usually -- we try to plan out at least two years. And it's a combination of factors why it's important to do it. One is the lead time and working with communities and seeing what level of interest there is. And then I think the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

22

23

24

that you've referred to, has looked out 10 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

at the blended pricing and whether this

than you have traditionally to the

expansion? Because one of the things that the Board has expressed interest in in the past and the Department has expressed interest is getting VGS to build out. And I think it's safe to say there hasn't always been a meeting of the minds as to the rapidity with which build out occurs; is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS: I guess that would be fair to say. I have been doing this for Vermont Gas Systems for 26 years, and I've seen different levels of interest in expansion. There have been times when we have had a strict growth pays for growth approach, and we have had others when we have really been encouraged and actually criticized for not working to expand further.

What we have tried to do with this project is find a good balance that will continue to provide these significant economic environmental benefits that we have seen in Chittenden and Franklin County to others counties like Addison and Rutland while still maintaining a competitive position to our existing customers. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

So it is a balancing, is that different than what we have done? We have done different things over the years, but that's a focus that we have at this point, trying to maintain that balance. Keep the competitive position, while we work to bring service to more Vermonters.

MR. YOUNG: Correct me if I am wrong, is this the -- well, now I'm going to ask it as a question as opposed to a statement. Is this the first time that the project expansion has actually been linked to a rate adjustment?

In other words, you know, it came through in the expansion fund. But there is essentially five percent above where the rates would have been. Has there been another time where one of these expansions, Jericho, whatever, has directly led to rate adjustments because of the nature of the expansion?

THE WITNESS: I have to think back here.

I don't think we have had one where -- and
let me maybe say, not to this magnitude

clearly. I don't know whether we may have
CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

seen the impact of one of those expansions
affect rates slightly. But when I say
slightly, again it evolves around the
competitive position.

The key here is the magnitude of it. We have been serving Chittenden, Franklin

County for almost 50 years and we are trying to bring gas down to Addison County. The state's very rural. It's a long way between the load centers. And so we really -- this is a magnitude that is much greater, and therefore, we felt we needed to come and seek the expansion fund in order to support that.

MR. YOUNG: I guess the reason I'm asking the questions is, you know, at least it appears to be a different way of looking at line extensions than some of the past line extensions. And the question is -- I'm trying to explore -- is this a test that the -- that you think the Board and VGS, for that matter, ought to be adopting in the future in terms of looking at line extensions, and maybe that will promote more expansion of the system. Or I mean CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

obviously you're thinking of going to

Rutland, you know, maybe in somebody's

dreams Waterbury. I mean I don't even know

-- I've never -- I haven't heard it

mentioned in a long time. But you know, is

this the type of model that you think ought
to be adopted?

THE WITNESS: Let me start with saying I don't know that it's that different than what we have done. If you think about the entire expansion or history, at Vermont Gas we were formed because there were 6 to 7,000 customers down in Burlington, and we could -- apparently they could justify bringing the transmission line down to displace the manufactured gas that was being used.

If we were just focused on a very, very strict growth pays for growth, I think you would see a different pattern of development and expansion in Vermont than what we have seen. I think what you would see is primarily Burlington, the most concentrated, most populated area, would have natural gas service, and some other communities would not.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

So I think we have had an approach that has been willing to support, have existing markets support new markets. Again I think it comes back to the magnitude of it. This is very significant. In Vermont we wouldn't have electricity up on the ridgelines without the Rural Electrification Act. We don't have a Rural Gasification Act. And so as I sought opportunities and dollars to support further expansion, we found we had to come back home, and there wasn't federal dollars, there weren't state dollars. We needed to build the fund in order to support that.

So to some degree, yes, it's different, but it's not. I'm sorry, to say -- to say it's confusing, but again I think it's the magnitudes of it. It's such a large expansion, and I mean again on the electric side you didn't see electricity except for rural electric -- rural gas -- Rural Electrification Act. That was a big thing to move out into those rural areas.

That's where we are. We have served the most populated areas in Vermont already. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

want to retract that statement.

I think I'm actually going to leave it there. I'm trying to figure out, is this different, is this a good thing, you know, because it's different. And that's why I was trying to explore that.

THE WITNESS: I'll just say that trying to wrap up this line of questioning that you've asked, we -- when we were formed in '65 we had the franchise to serve the state. And as you point out, there have been different views over the years about how effectively we have been doing that.

And we are hearing from Vermonters they want more natural gas service. I hear it every day when I'm out and about people stop me and ask if they can get service. I had somebody want service in Wells River. I had to tell them I didn't think we would get over that far. But in those areas where we can I do think we need to follow as much as possible the existing policies and practices, but also be flexible in doing that.

And this balance between expanding to serve as many Vermonters as possible while CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

maintaining a competitive position, I think is the way that we have come to, that we think we can do it. We are looking at and thinking about the potential to expand into other corners of the state with individual lines and possibly looking at zoned rates in those areas.

In this case, it's a contiguous area, we think it makes sense to use the existing market and develop one rate for that entire market. I think the benefits are so significant it makes sense to do it this way.

MR. YOUNG: Great. Thank you. I think you've answered what I wanted to go at. I have been informed by the Board members that I should probably do an identification. I'm George Young, Policy Director of the Public Service Board.

MR. COEN: I'm David Coen, a member of the Public Service Board. Good morning.

THE WITNESS: Good morning, Mr. Coen.

MR. COEN: I have a couple of questions for you. One is that, you know, when I visit with my colleagues around the country, CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

development, we saw, quite frankly, people

	Pa	ge 59
1	MR. COEN: Right; right.	
2	THE WITNESS: So there has been a long	
3	history of some types of hydraulic	
4	fracturing. What you're hearing the most	
5	recent concerns about are some of the newer	
6	technology that was adopted from the water	
7	industry.	
8	MR. COEN: But in essence in order to	
9	extract gas for it's been in our lifetime	ıe
10	it's probably been fracked in some way,	
11	shape or form.	
12	THE WITNESS: I believe that is correct	•
13	MR. COEN: Okay. And another area. Ir	1
14	terms of this pipeline you're proposing to	
15	build down to Middlebury your testimony	
16	basically at this point it's oversized from	ì
17	what the projected need is; is that correct	?
18	THE WITNESS: In anticipation of	
19	Ticonderoga and Rutland, yes.	
20	MR. COEN: And would you say that's	
21	consistent with the way maybe VELCO propose	:S
22	to build a transmission line, you don't fil	.1
23	it all the first day.	
24	THE WITNESS: That's an interesting	
25	question. The electric industry is CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067	

different than gas. And so my understanding is yes, you have to put in a certain size capacity because you can't build segments of it like you can in the gas industry. But it's consistent with what our practice has been.

We tried to anticipate growth, like I said in Williston, and build it to a size that we think will accommodate that.

MR. COEN: In terms of some questions that Mr. Saudek asked you regarding leakage of methane, this last few months I was able to take a look at a new technology for detecting methane leaks, and I think the company was named Pecaro, it may not be the sole company using that technology. You get in a vehicle, and they have this satellite or something on their roof and they find -- you can spot a methane leak within a half a mile or something of where you are. Are you familiar with that?

THE WITNESS: I've heard of technology like that. I don't know if I know that specific technology. I know part of the Northeast Gas Association has a group that's CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

that was done -- early on we said we would CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

	Page 63
1	love to do that. We are too small. They
2	want to do it with a much larger company.
3	I'm not sure I answered your question.
4	MR. COEN: That's correct. I assume one
5	of these vehicles one of these units is
6	probably very expensive. It may not be an
7	appropriate expense for Vermont Gas, but
8	very well may be an expense for Gaz Metro.
9	Is this something that you could borrow or
10	lease from Gaz Metro to use? Is that the
11	kind of relationship you have with your
12	parent company, or are you completely
13	separate?
14	THE WITNESS: No. If they had
15	technology that we couldn't afford, we
16	certainly would have we have the kind of
17	relationship that we could borrow or lease
18	that type of technology from them. And we
19	have worked with them on many things like
20	that.
21	MR. COEN: Thank you.
22	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I didn't fully
23	understand the question.
24	MR. COEN: It's all right.
25	MR. BURKE: Morning, Mr. Gilbert. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

1 THE WITNESS: Morning, Mr. Burke.

2 MR. BURKE: The LNG issue sort of
3 intrigues me. If a supplier could
4 conceivably make more money directing its

5 supply of gas for LNG export, isn't it

6 likely that's where they would send it?

THE WITNESS: I would think so. Yes.

MR. BURKE: And if in fact that's what occurs, the impact for those that are on distribution lines would be a negative impact. And in fact, the product they might get, would it have an effect on that in your view?

THE WITNESS: I don't think it

necessarily would. If there was -- and the

reason -- let me just be clear -- is because

of the supply. There is such a large supply

right now of natural gas in North America

that the projections that I've seen, and

there is a Woods Mackenzie report that was

presented at one of the NECPUC conferences I

think many of us attended, indicated that

even if we were to see producers begin to

export LNG, it would not have a significant

impact on the overall price of natural gas

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 65 in North America. 1 2 MR. BURKE: It is interesting what 3 fracking has done because when LNG terminals were first proposed it was to import. And 5 now it seems more to export. That's not to say that the supply of gas, no matter what 6 7 the source, whether it's hydraulic 8 fracturing, traditional drilling, it's not 9 limitless, is it? 10 THE WITNESS: I don't believe it's 11 limitless, but the supplies -- and I think in one of the other studies -- we saw they 12 are saying there is over 140 years of supply 13 14 that they see out there today. They 15 continue to develop it. 16 I'm also hearing they keep refining this 17 technology. They find different types of 18 shales that they can extract it from, and 19 they find ways to improve it. We have seen 20 it expand into oil and propane production as 21 well. 22 MR. BURKE: Thanks. Let me switch gears 23 to the other thing I wanted to talk about. 24 THE WITNESS: Okay. 25 This is phase one. That was

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

MR. BURKE:

explored and established in a previous 1 question. But it's also clear that you make 3 much of your return by recapturing and then making a fair return on equity on your 5 infrastructure, isn't that true? THE WITNESS: We are allowed a return on 6 7 our infrastructure, that's correct. 8 MR. BURKE: Well assuming ratepayers are 9 the ones that pick that up, can you tell me 10 what the differential, if you know, what the 11 differential would be in the larger main to 12 Middlebury versus I think it was a six-inch

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know what the differential would be?

main that was originally discussed. Do you

THE WITNESS: I don't. I think it was larger than -- well we have looked at several alternatives early on. But I don't think it was a jump from a six-inch to a 12-inch. I think it was -- probably Ms. Simollardes could address that directly about what the change was and try to quantify for you what the difference was.

MR. BURKE: Well let me ask you this then, from your position, and I will ask Ms.

Simollardes, because I've never seen you CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

time, it all depends on what happens with

- growth in that area, there would be an
- 2 increased cost to the existing ratepayers.
- 3 MR. BURKE: And is there an ongoing
- 4 maintenance increase as well, or is there
- 5 little or no difference there based on the
- 6 size of the line?
- 7 THE WITNESS: I don't think the
- 8 maintenance aspect would be the significant
- 9 factor. Whether it's a 10-inch or a 12-inch
- 10 pipe.
- MR. BURKE: Thank you.
- 12 THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
- 13 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: We have finished asking
- 14 our questions.
- 15 Are there any questions that follow up
- on the questions that we asked? Yes, Ms.
- 17 Levine.
- MS. LEVINE: A few. Thank you.
- 19 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 20 BY MS. LEVINE:
- Q. Hello again.
- 22 A. Hello again.
- Q. Mr. Young asked you some questions in which
- 24 you responded that in your opinion there would continue to
- 25 be low and competitive price for gas going forward, do you CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 recall those?
- 2 A. Yes, I do.
- 3 Q. Can you identify what time frame?
- A. I'm trying to think. It may have been one of
- 5 the studies that we provided in response to discovery, was
- 6 talking about decades out into the future.
- 7 Q. But you have not provided any testimony in
- 8 this proceeding regarding that. Vermont Gas did not
- 9 provide any testimony?
- 10 A. I think I've said that from my understanding
- 11 we will continue to see competitive prices well out in the
- 12 future. I think I did.
- 13 Q. And but studies to support that were not
- 14 provided as part of your petition or your testimony?
- 15 A. I think they were provided in response to
- 16 discovery requests.
- 17 Q. Discovery requests are not part of the
- 18 evidence presented unless a party offers it. Is that your
- 19 understanding?
- 20 A. Would you like us to --
- 21 Q. No.
- 22 A. Okay.
- 23 Q. But my question is whether that was provided
- 24 in support of your petition or testimony, and it was not;
- 25 correct?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. I was asked what my statements were based on.
- 2 It was provided in support on what my statements were
- 3 based on.
- 4 Q. And Mr. Coen asked you some questions
- 5 regarding experience, and it seemed to be what you've
- 6 heard among gas suppliers throughout the country, do you
- 7 recall those questions?
- 8 A. I think so. Specifically?
- 9 Q. And specifically regarding the use of
- 10 hydraulic fracturing, do you recall that?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And again as far as the testimony and exhibits
- 13 you've presented in this case you have not presented any
- 14 analysis regarding the impacts of hydraulic fracturing; is
- 15 that correct?
- 16 A. I think I've stated that the new technology
- 17 which includes hydraulic fracturing has resolved in a fast
- increase in the supply of natural gas and has helped to
- 19 drive prices down, and it was in general terms I talked
- 20 about the hydraulic fracturing.
- 21 Q. So that was in general terms and not based on
- 22 any specific exhibits or studies that you've presented in
- 23 this case; correct?
- 24 A. Well again, I think that the -- the responses
- 25 to discovery were what I based that on. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. My recollection is your response to Mr. Coen
- 2 was that you're hearing more and more people address that
- 3 they are becoming more and more comfortable with hydraulic
- 4 fracturing?
- 5 A. I'm seeing that.
- 6 Q. Okay. And are there studies that you have
- 7 presented as part of this petition in support of your
- 8 petition that support that?
- 9 A. It's based on my personal experience in the
- 10 meetings I've attended and what I've heard from the
- 11 various consultants I've listened to.
- 12 Q. So it's your experience based on what you're
- 13 hearing?
- 14 A. And the conferences I attend and the people
- 15 that I've listened to that have presented at those
- 16 conferences.
- 17 Q. And did you attend the public hearing in
- 18 Middlebury last week?
- 19 A. I did.
- 20 Q. And did you hear comments from a number of
- 21 people expressing serious concerns about hydraulic
- 22 fracturing?
- 23 A. I heard individuals express that not all of
- them had the expertise of the people that I've heard from
- 25 at these other conferences.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. But you've heard it expressed from people who
- 2 are within the State of Vermont; correct?
- 3 A. I did. And that's an area where there is not
- 4 experience with hydraulic fracturing other than the water
- 5 industry.
- 6 Q. And Mr. Burke asked you some questions
- 7 regarding approval of phase one and phase two and whether
- 8 there would be an increase in cost for the difference in
- 9 the size of the project for phase one and phase two, do
- 10 you recall those?
- 11 A. I do.
- 12 Q. Your responses were limited to economic costs;
- is that correct?
- 14 A. Can you -- I'm not sure what you're asking.
- 15 Q. Dollar cost to customers.
- 16 A. Whether the size of the pipe would result in
- 17 additional cost.
- 18 Q. Yes.
- 19 A. Yes, I was addressing that.
- Q. Economic costs only.
- A. As opposed to?
- 22 Q. Environmental costs?
- 23 A. I didn't specifically address that. I can if
- 24 you would like. I didn't -- I didn't understand that the
- 25 question was posed to address specifically environmental CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 costs.
- 2 O. I don't think it was.
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 Q. And your response addressed simply the
- 5 economic costs; correct?
- A. I did. But that doesn't mean that there isn't
- 7 also the environmental side to that.
- 8 MS. LEVINE: Thank you. That's all.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 10 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Any other
- follow up to the questions we asked? Yes,
- 12 Mr. Saudek.
- MR. SAUDEK: I would like to follow up
- on Mr. Coen's questions.
- 15 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 16 BY MR. SAUDEK:
- 17 Q. Given that hydraulic fracturing has been
- 18 around for a long time, what was it -- what -- can you
- 19 pinpoint a little bit better the -- what difference or
- 20 differences happen that resulted in this rather rapid and
- 21 very steep reduction in the cost of gas?
- 22 A. Here's my understanding, again from the
- 23 conferences and the experts that I've listened to. We saw
- 24 for years a conventional approach for extracting natural
- 25 gas that involved drilling into pockets of natural gas CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 74

- 1 that they knew were below the surface. And they knew they
- 2 were going by layers of shale where there was gas that was
- 3 contained. They didn't know how to extract that.
- 4 And over the years some of the producers
- 5 experimented with different technologies, and one of the
- 6 key technologies was directional drilling. When they
- 7 learned that they could actually drill down to these
- 8 layers and directionally drill into these layers, and then
- 9 they combined it with a practice that had been used by the
- 10 water industry, with hydraulic fracturing, and when they
- 11 combined those, one of the producers found a way to start
- 12 to extract natural gas.
- And they knew there were large amounts of
- 14 shale that contained natural gas. So I think the key
- 15 thing that triggered that was this producer demonstrating
- 16 this could be done commercially viable way. And the other
- 17 producers jumped on it very quickly. So someone finally
- 18 cracking that challenge of how to extract gas from these
- 19 formations that had so much of it in shales, I think was
- 20 what really drove it.
- 21 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: And by directional
- drilling you mean instead of going straight
- down you would go off to the side on a
- 24 horizontal way?
- 25 THE WITNESS: Correct. They can CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1 actually drill now, instead of the

2 conventional approach drilling straight

down, they can drill down, steer the drill

bit into these layers of shale, and be able

5 to access large quantities of natural gas

6 that are captured in the shales.

7 BY MR. SAUDEK:

- 8 Q. Has that development, horizontal drilling or
- 9 whatever -- directional drilling, is that part of the
- 10 concern that you've heard raised, the environmental
- 11 concern that you have heard raised about these processes?
- 12 A. Well early on there were a lot of questions
- 13 about what the environmental impact was. And again we
- 14 talked about the EPA studies. They have addressed a lot
- of that over years that this has been developing.
- 16 Q. Supposing other states -- I'm trying not to
- 17 ask something I've asked already. Supposing other states
- 18 banned hydraulic fracturing, and they are states that have
- 19 serious deposits of natural gas, as opposed to --
- 20 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: I think you're straying
- into an area that is beyond what we were
- 22 asking. But --
- MR. SAUDEK: Oh, okay.
- 24 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: And I think you did
- 25 touch on this before.
 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 76
1	MR. SAUDEK: Very well. I have nothing
2	further.
3	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Any other
4	follow up to our questions? Not to the
5	follow up to our questions but just to our
6	questions?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: All right. Great. Is
9	there any redirect?
10	MS. HAYDEN: No redirect.
11	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. So I think
12	we are ready for our next witness which is
13	I think is Mr. Wark.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CADITOI COIDE DEDODEDO INC
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

- 1 STEPHEN J. WARK
- 2 Having been duly sworn, testified
- 3 as follows:
- 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 6 Q. Good morning, Mr. Wark.
- 7 MR. COEN: Do you want to bring the mic
- 8 closer? Not you. You.
- 9 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 10 Q. Good morning, Mr. Wark.
- 11 A. Good morning.
- 12 Q. Do you have in front of you a document --
- MR. COEN: Mr. Wark, would you please
- 14 state your name for the record?
- THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Stephen
- Wark. W-A-R-K.
- MR. COEN: Thank you.
- 18 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 19 Q. Thank you. Sorry about that. Do you have in
- 20 front of you a document entitled "Prefiled Testimony of
- 21 Stephen J. Wark on behalf of Vermont Gas Systems" dated
- 22 December 20 and consisting of 27 pages together with title
- 23 page and index?
- 24 A. I do.
- 25 Q. And was that document prepared by you or under CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 your direct supervision?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Is it true and accurate to the best of your
- 4 knowledge and belief?
- 5 A. It is.
- 6 Q. Are there any corrections that you need to
- 7 make at this time?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. And do you also have a document entitled
- 10 "2/28/13 Supplemental Prefiled Testimony of Stephen J.
- 11 Wark on behalf of Vermont Gas Systems" consisting of seven
- 12 pages of testimony together with an index and cover page?
- 13 A. I do.
- 14 Q. And that document was prepared by you or under
- 15 your direct supervision?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Is it true and accurate to the best of your
- 18 knowledge and belief?
- 19 A. It is.
- 20 Q. Are there any corrections that you need to
- 21 make at this time?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. I would refer you to the exhibits that you
- 24 prefiled. Starting with exhibit -- your exhibits on
- 25 direct.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-606/

Page 79

- 1 MS. HAYDEN: I don't know if the Chair
- 2 would like me to go through each exhibit or
- just reference them generally. There were
- 4 several exhibits that were filed.
- 5 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: You can do it
- 6 collectively.
- 7 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you.
- 8 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 9 Q. If you turn to the index to your prefiled
- 10 testimony dated December 20, it lists a number of exhibits
- 11 starting with exhibit Petitioner SJW-1 and ending with
- exhibit Petitioner SJW-4 or 4.18, do you see that?
- 13 A. I do.
- 14 Q. And were those documents collected by you or
- 15 prepared by you?
- 16 A. Collected or prepared or received by the
- 17 company.
- 18 Q. Thank you. Are there any corrections or --
- 19 that we need to make to those documents?
- 20 A. No.
- Q. And then turning to your February testimony,
- 22 you also have in your exhibit list a number of exhibits
- 23 that are titled exhibit Petitioner's Supplemental SJW-1
- 24 through SJW-11.
- 25 A. Yes.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1 Richmond Road area.

MR. YOUNG: I didn't see anything saying has a study been done, what were the results.

THE WITNESS: The study I think is just about complete. It was primarily sounding. So the two challenges were in that area, as I recall, the amount of load, how many houses and businesses; and then the second was the ledge. And so we were going out doing significant ledge soundings through the area because many communities were asking for more natural gas.

MR. YOUNG: So as of this time you don't have a final proposal on whether you're going to expand in that direction or -- and you're still in discussions with Hinesburg, is that fair?

THE WITNESS: I don't know if we are in discussions with Hinesburg. I do know that much more work has been done by our sales and marketing team. I don't know the status of those. Sorry.

MR. YOUNG: Let me ask you about your Exhibit SJW-4.1. And this is -- I'll give CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YOUNG: As I look down there starting three full paragraphs from the bottom it identifies a number of needs; Williston needs; should the line be built, certain costs, and there are recommendations there which are continued awareness and informational training, advanced training, and more sophisticated metering equipment would be needed.

provide these to the Town of Williston?

THE WITNESS: We have not in a formal discussion with them. However, we do provide training and are willing to provide more training. We have increased our public CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Have you had -- have you agreed to

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

,	Page 85				
1	THE WITNESS: Thank you.				
2	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. Are there any				
3	follow-up questions to Mr. Young's				
4	questions?				
5	(No response.)				
6	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Are there any redirect?				
7	MS. HAYDEN: No redirect.				
8	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. Mr. Wark, you're				
9	excused. Thank you. I guess we are ready				
10	for Ms. Simollardes, if she is ready for all				
11	the questions that were punted to her.				
12	MS. HAYDEN: Just handing the witness				
13	her testimony and exhibits.				
14	MR. COEN: You can sit down, Ms.				
15	Simollardes.				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25	CARLEST COURT DEPOSITION TWO				
CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067					

1	EILEEN	SIMOLLARDES		

2 Having been duly sworn, testified

3 as follows:

4 MS. HAYDEN: Before we proceed, Ms.

5 Simollardes was a witness that was

6 identified to provide surrebuttal, live

7 surrebuttal. And my thinking was that we

8 would -- I would introduce her as a witness

and get her testimony and exhibits into the

10 record, and then walk through that questions

and answers for her live surrebuttal. We

12 didn't talk about that this morning.

13 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yeah, that makes sense

14 because that way the parties will have heard

it before they start questioning her, which

is always helpful.

MS. HAYDEN: All right.

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MS. HAYDEN:

9

15

- 20 Q. Ms. Simollardes, let's -- can you state your
- 21 name and occupation for the record?
- 22 A. I'm Eileen Simollardes, I'm the Vice President
- 23 of Supply and Regulatory Affairs for Vermont Gas Systems,
- 24 and I'm currently serving in the capacity of Project
- 25 Director for this project.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. And as I understand it, you are also, in
- 2 addition to the testimony that you prefiled, you are also
- 3 providing or adopting the testimony of Mr. Lyons; is that
- 4 correct?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- 6 Q. Starting with your December 20 testimony, do
- 7 you have that with you?
- 8 A. I do.
- 9 Q. And this is a document consisting of 11 pages
- 10 together with a cover page. Was that prepared by you or
- 11 under your direct supervision?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And is it true and accurate to the best of
- 14 your knowledge and belief?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Are there any corrections?
- 17 A. No corrections. There is information that is
- 18 updated. As Mr. Gilbert referenced, the project costs are
- 19 now 86.6. And there were -- there was information in here
- 20 around competitive position that was a point in time
- 21 estimate. It's not a correction. It's just information
- 22 would be slightly different if you did it today.
- 23 Q. And with your direct testimony you had two
- 24 exhibits identified as exhibit Petitioner EMS-1 and EMS-2.
- 25 Were those two documents prepared by you or under your CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 direct supervision?
- 2 A. They were.
- 3 Q. And are they true and accurate to the best of
- 4 your information and belief?
- 5 A. Yes.
- Q. Any corrections to make to those two
- 7 documents?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. And you also submitted prefiled testimony on
- 10 June 28, 2013 consisting of 13 pages, do you have that
- 11 with you?
- 12 A. I do.
- 13 Q. Was that prepared by you or under your direct
- 14 supervision?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And is it true and accurate to the best of
- 17 your knowledge and belief?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Are there any corrections that you need to
- 20 make at this time?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 Q. And with your rebuttal testimony you also had
- 23 two exhibits identified as exhibit Petitioner Rebuttal
- 24 EMS-1 and Petitioner Rebuttal EMS-2. Were those documents
- 25 prepared by you or reviewed by you in connection with your CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 rebuttal testimony?
- 2 A. They were reviewed by me. Neither of these
- 3 documents were prepared by me.
- Q. Okay. And the agreement between Vermont Gas
- 5 and the Monkton Central School which is exhibit Petitioner
- 6 EMS Rebuttal EMS-1, were you involved in the negotiations
- 7 of that agreement?
- 8 A. Yes, I was.
- 9 O. Okay. And it's true and accurate to the best
- 10 of your knowledge and belief as far as the Memorandum of
- 11 Understanding or agreement reached between Vermont Gas
- 12 Systems and the Monkton School?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. All right. And you have had a chance to
- 15 review exhibit Petitioner Rebuttal EMS-2, the memorandum
- 16 from VHB regarding organic certification?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And if there are -- I'll stop there.
- 19 MS. HAYDEN: With this I move the
- admission of the prefiled testimony and the
- 21 rebuttal testimony of Eileen Simollardes
- 22 together with the exhibits that have been
- referred to.
- 24 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection? Did you
- want -- did you already move the admission CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 91
1	and Petitioner Rebuttal EMS-1 and Rebuttal
2	EMS-2 were admitted into the record.)
3	(The Prefiled Testimony of Eileen
4	Simollardes was admitted into the record.)
5	Simolialdes was admitted into the record.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CADIMOI COUDE DEDODEDO INO
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

- 1 MS. HAYDEN: And if I may, I'm going to
- 2 hand the witness Mr. Lyons's prefiled
- 3 testimony and exhibits.
- 4 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 5 Q. Ms. Simollardes, do you have in front of you
- 6 prefiled testimony of Timothy S. Lyons dated December 20,
- 7 2012, consisting of 16 pages together with a cover page
- 8 and table of contents?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And I understand this was not prepared by you,
- 11 but have you since the time of that -- this was filed --
- 12 have you reviewed this testimony?
- 13 A. I have.
- 14 O. And is it true and accurate to the best of
- 15 your knowledge and belief?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Are there any corrections that you would need
- 18 to make to this testimony?
- 19 A. Not a correction, but an update. On page 14
- 20 line 18, there is a reference to the timed filing of the
- 21 Section 248 relative to the International Paper project,
- 22 and it says it would be submitted in July 2013. That did
- 23 not happen. And the expected filing date now is November
- 24 2013.
- Q. And do you also have what's been marked as CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 exhibit Petitioner TSL 1.1 through exhibit Petitioner TSL
- 2 10?
- 3 A. I do.
- 4 Q. And have you had a chance to review those
- 5 documents since the time that this prefiled testimony was
- 6 submitted to the Board?
- 7 A. I have.
- 8 Q. And are these documents true and accurate to
- 9 the best of your knowledge and belief?
- 10 A. Yes.
- MS. HAYDEN: I move the admission of the
- 12 prefiled testimony of Timothy Lyons from
- December together with the exhibits that
- 14 were prefiled with Mr. Lyons' testimony.
- 15 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
- 16 (No response.)
- 17 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: All right. They are
- 18 admitted.
- 19 (Exhibits marked Petitioner TSL-1.1
- 20 through TSL-10 were admitted into the
- 21 record.)
- 22 (The Prefiled Testimony of Timothy S.
- Lyons was admitted into the record.)

24

25

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

- 1 MR. KREIS: I didn't have a copy of
- 2 those exhibits. I have all the rest of
- 3 them. Thank you.
- 4 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Is the witness available
- for cross examination? You're going to walk
- 6 her through the live surrebuttal?
- 7 MS. HAYDEN: Yes.
- 8 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 9 Q. Ms. Simollardes, the Palmers in their rebuttal
- 10 testimony state that Vermont Gas has not entirely
- 11 responded to their questions in discovery as to why
- 12 Vermont Gas has proposed in its February filing to move
- 13 off the VELCO corridor and to locate the pipeline on the
- 14 Palmer parcel.
- 15 Can you please explain the reasons that VGS
- 16 has considered in making that decision as well as any
- 17 alternatives that Vermont Gas has evaluated?
- 18 A. Yes, we had prepared a surrebuttal exhibit
- 19 that may be helpful in using -- may be helpful to refer to
- 20 in this conversation.
- MS. HAYDEN: Then I have provided a copy
- of this surrebuttal exhibit which we have
- marked as surrebuttal. And I've provided a
- copy to all of the parties per the
- instruction of Mr. Young at our prehearing CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

And we are in or on the Palmers' property, and

25

- 1 that little deviation from the VELCO corridor down the
- 2 Norris property, over across the Palmers and Latreilles,
- 3 and back to VELCO is what we in shorthand call the Rotax
- 4 Road reroute. If I use that expression that's what I'm
- 5 referring to.
- 6 We are in the Rotax Road reroute for really a
- 7 totality of issues. If you look at this map you can see
- 8 it is a particular pinch point for VELCO. When we first
- 9 proposed this project in the 12/20 alignment, in other
- 10 words, the pipeline alignment that was underlying our
- 11 initial filing back in December, we were on the western
- 12 side of the VELCO right of way. As I'm looking at this I
- 13 realize you can't really read the structure numbers, which
- 14 is unfortunate. Maybe you can see them on this map. We
- were on the VELCO right of way on the western side from
- 16 roughly structure 181 through 189. And we were going to
- 17 horizontally directionally drill that. You really can't
- 18 read it on those exhibits. You can see here better.
- 19 We were in the VELCO right of way, on the
- 20 western side, from about here to here. And this whole
- 21 piece was being horizontally directionally drilled, and
- then we went back to the eastern side of the VELCO
- 23 corridor until just about structure 190. And then we
- 24 crossed back over to the western side of the VELCO
- 25 corridor.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 This particular area in the vicinity of
- 2 structure 190 was a pinch point for VELCO. They had told
- 3 us very specifically after we had filed this that they did
- 4 not want us located on the eastern side of their right of
- 5 way, and it was their strong preference that we not be
- 6 located on the western side of their right of way. When
- 7 we combined that with the feedback we got from the Monkton
- 8 community about the desire to locate our pipe to the
- 9 extent possible more than 300 feet from structures and
- 10 wells, and we went back and we looked at everything, we
- 11 realized that the reroute down the side of the Norris
- 12 property and across the Palmers achieved several
- 13 objectives. It got us out of that western side of the
- 14 VELCO corridor which they had indicated was a pinch point
- 15 for them. It avoided constructability issues. As you can
- 16 see there is a meandering stream on the top, and then this
- 17 is a really deep ravine over to the right, and it's an
- 18 archeologically sensitive area. And there were more
- 19 structures along the way in the VELCO corridor than there
- 20 was to the Palmer property.
- 21 The closest distance between the pipe and the
- 22 Palmer residence in the reroute is about 120 feet. If we
- 23 are back in the VELCO corridor, we are within 85 feet from
- 24 one residence, about 110 feet from another, and close to a
- 25 third residence well. So for the totality of those CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 issues, we moved ourselves into the Rotax Road reroute.
- 2 We have since explored what it would look like
- 3 going back into the VELCO corridor. And I have to say we
- 4 have also since entered into an agreement with the Town of
- 5 Monkton on the alignment that you have before you for the
- 6 12/28. And Vermont Gas continues to firmly believe that
- 7 is the appropriate alignment. If we were ordered to go
- 8 back into the VELCO corridor we would have to horizontally
- 9 directionally drill most of that section, from just north
- 10 of that meandering stream to just north of the deep
- 11 ravine. Then we would have to horizontally directionally
- 12 drill again from north of that direction -- that deep
- 13 ravine to just -- I guess that's just this side, my --
- 14 left of the VELCO guy wire, and then we could trench from
- 15 there.
- 16 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Can you use the big map
- and point to where those things are?
- THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry.
- 19 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: I'm not following you.
- 20 So where is the Palmers' property?
- 21 THE WITNESS: This is the Palmers'
- 22 property here. This is the Palmers'
- property here.
- 24 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yeah.
- THE WITNESS: If we were to go back into CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

They have not prohibited us from being

25

on the western side of t	ihat	corridor.
--------------------------	------	-----------

2 MR. COEN: We have heard their 3 preferences before as well, okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Okay. So if we were in the VELCO corridor we would have to drill, and I apologize that I can't show everybody the map at the same time, but we would have to drill from approximately structure 181 to somewhere between structure 184 to avoid this meandering stream, because you don't want to install the pipe longitudinally with a stream that could be subject to erosion, so we would have to drill that. And it would allow us to avoid this archeological area. Then we would have to do a second drill because before we were on the eastern side so we could trench, but now that we know we would need to be on the western side we would have to do a second drill from somewhere between this structure here to down somewhere right around here.

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: You don't know the structure numbers?

THE WITNESS: I do. Give me one second.

We would have to have a second drill from CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 102
1	somewhere between structure 185 and 186 to
2	about 189 and 190, which is right in here.
3	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay.
4	MR. COEN: So it's doable.
5	THE WITNESS: It is doable.
6	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: It's going to increase
7	the cost.
8	THE WITNESS: It's going to increase the
9	cost. It would cost roughly 1.2 to 1.3
10	million to do those drills.
11	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Additional over what
12	you're proposing?
13	THE WITNESS: Over what we are
14	proposing. So there would in fact be
15	slightly less pipe, because this piece that
16	comes here we wouldn't need to do. And I
17	took a look at what would we be able to
18	avoid for this piece here, and we could
19	avoid maybe about \$90,000 worth of pipe.
20	But if we were to go into
21	MR. COEN: And also easement costs;
22	right?
23	THE WITNESS: No. Because we still need
24	to acquire an easement from the underlying
25	landowners. Yes, there would be some CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

understand what we are looking at on the

25

	Page 104
1	map. The area that is depicted here in, I
2	guess it's sort of pink, is that looks like
3	it's about 300 feet wide, is that the VELCO
4	right of way?
5	THE WITNESS: It is.
6	MR. YOUNG: And the sort of white line
7	that's on the western part of that, that's
8	where the existing transmission line runs.
9	There is a white line, that dashed black
10	lines?
11	THE WITNESS: This thing? Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Electric transmission
13	line.
14	THE WITNESS: Electric transmission
15	line.
16	MR. YOUNG: That's the existing electric
17	transmission line.
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
19	MR. YOUNG: That's where it's located.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	MR. YOUNG: VELCO actually has all this
22	additional space that they acquired for
23	that.
24	THE WITNESS: You'll need to ask VELCO
25	that but CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

numbers because again Vermont Gas believes

25

that the route we have in totality is the right place.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's very unfortunate that not everybody can be happy with it, but we do believe that is in totality the right place. We have also looked at two other potential alternatives in response to the Palmers' concern. One would be the Palmers did give us a right of entry for the westernmost part — parcel of their land to take a look at could we locate the pipe on the very western edge of their property.

The bulk of that land is in a federal conservation easement. There is a portion of it that is not. But you cannot get all the way to the Rotax Road reroute without going through that federal conservation easement. We believe we would have to horizontally directionally drill that as well, and that would be -- there is more pipe, and there is more HDD. In aggregate that would be about \$700,000 more expensive. But the other piece to keep in mind is the outcome of the amending a federally conserved easement is uncertain. We did CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

take a look at that. 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The installation of a pipeline is not a permitted activity in those easements, it's not prohibited but it is not permitted. So Vermont Gas and the Palmers together would need to ask for that easement to be amended. It then needs to go through a public comment period, a full NEPA. The outcome of that is uncertain.

And one the criteria we would need to be able to address is whether or not there was a viable alternative, and we have just discussed two alternatives. One of which is the VELCO, and the other of which is locating the pipe on the Palmers' property, not within the conservation easement.

MR. KREIS: So by federal conservation easement you mean an instrumentality of the United States Government owns that easement?

THE WITNESS: It's enrolled in a program called the -- I always get this acronym wrong -- NCRS. It's a wetland protection program but a federal wetland protection program as opposed to the land conservation easements that we have with, for example, CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1	Vermont	Land	Trust	or	VHB	and	the	Ag
2	Departme	ent.						

MR. YOUNG: Where is the eastern edge of that area, that conserved area?

THE WITNESS: It's very hard to see.

But it is sort of -- there is a pale green

line. It's sort of -- or there is -- maybe

this little blue stream thing. It's a

little bit about right in there. I actually

do have -- I don't have it marked for an

exhibit, but we do have an enlargement. I

could get you an enlargement after lunch of

that federally conserved area, and you can

see the delineation of the conservation

easement.

MR. YOUNG: I guess what I'm curious about, is it this green area, or is it the light blue area that we are talking? And perhaps --

THE WITNESS: If you look up -- well they are overlaid on each other. If you look up at the legend, wetlands reserve program easement is where the little -- they look like little shrub things that are in there. There may be a map that's better CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

between the pipe and the Palmers' residence, which brings me to the fourth thing we looked at which is the Palmers have raised concerns about the impact of the pipe on the hydrology of their land and the proximity to their home, both of which we think are issues that we can adequately address as the pipeline is constructed. But it would also be possible to utilize horizontal directional drilling through that area of the Palmers' property and thus not disturbing the soil at all and not changing the composition or how much the soil would be compacted.

We could drill through there. And if we were to drill that section, rather than open trench it, we could scoot the pipe 40 feet further away from the Palmers' property, make it close to 160 feet rather than the current 120 feet. There, of course, would be a cost of that, somewhere in the order of 250 to \$300,000. And I need to specify in all these cases where I'm mentioning drill costs I'm using rules of thumb because these drills have not been designed. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

that the eastern side of the right of way is

25

instead of trenching, and this would be an

-- I'm now getting well into the area that I

really have no business speaking to the

construction technique -- so Mr. Heintz or

Mr. Teixeira could, but it's my

understanding that if we were to drill that,

that because we need temporary work space,

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

21

22

23

24

25

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

if this is a -- you know, this little

whatever you want to call this, this middle leg, that's the only place we were on the eastern side.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YOUNG: Okay. So but on that particular stretch which parallels essentially post 186, 189, or 188, 9, and your guy wire which I presume is 190, it looks like you would end up having to clear all those trees out as part of your construction.

THE WITNESS: I need to point out that in that particular area where you're talking about the trees, Vermont Gas is actually not proposing to go into the VELCO corridor there at all. We have acquired an option on the Bailey property, the land there. And we would propose regardless of where we ended up with VELCO to stay on the Bailey property there.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.

MR. COEN: Where is that on the map?

THE WITNESS: It's not labeled. Where

this big block is it says approximate

McGinnis well location. The Bailey property

starts somewhere right in here, so even if CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

we came down hypothetically, the VELCO

corridor, we would want to rejoin the pipe

where it is now on the Bailey property.

Because we do have an option on that land, the landowner is amenable. It is a site that we are looking at potentially for the gate station in Monkton. There does not appear to be controversy on locating the pipe on the Bailey property.

So I don't know that it would be necessary to move it back into the VELCO corridor. In fact, if you look at the 12/20 alignment on the VELCO corridor there, there is a lot of these funky little land parcels that are like slices of pie that we are able to avoid by being on the VELCO property in that area.

MR. COEN: Bailey.

THE WITNESS: I mean Bailey property, yes.

MR. YOUNG: You're farther down than where I was asking about. I was asking about essentially looking at this, if you see the existing dwelling that says approximately 15 feet from right of way.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1	THE	WITNESS:	Yes.

2 MR. YOUNG: Between there and the line there are a whole series of trees.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: And that's the area that I believe you just said that you had originally been proposing to be on the east side of the VELCO line; correct?

THE WITNESS: Initially we were on the east side up through there. Through 187 to 190.

MR. YOUNG: Right. That was the area I was asking you. So that would seem to require that you end up cutting those trees down, and that's before you hop off to the Bailey property; am I correct? Or have you looked -- not looked at that?

THE WITNESS: It appears that way on the map. I would suggest that perhaps Mr.

Heintz who is -- I have actually not gone out and been in the VELCO corridor on that particular location. It would be preferable to speak to somebody who has, but I would agree with you at least looking at this map that would -- appears that that would have CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1 to happen.

MR. YOUNG: And one final question which is are you referring to -- if you were on the Palmer property, and did the directional drill, you could do it about 40 feet farther west based upon the engineering, is there any reason you couldn't do the trenching about 40 feet farther west as well?

THE WITNESS: That I don't know. I would suggest you ask Mr. Heintz. It would depend -- my understanding is we need a place to store the soil. So -- that you take out of the trench, so if we could have a temporary work space deeper into the Palmer property it may be able to trench that way. That I don't know.

MR. YOUNG: And would that avoid some of the impacts that he's expressed concern about, or perhaps avoid cutting down some of the trees in the area? To your knowledge.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe it would avoid the Palmers' concern with the potential change in hydrology. And as to whether or not it would change the need for the trees that were in question, the willow CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

We don't have any further surrebuttal. The
Board did ask Ms. Simollardes a question
about whether she knew if the project as
originally proposed was entirely on the east
side -- west side --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear.

MS. HAYDEN: The Board had a question about the pipeline, the location of the pipeline, I'm sorry, currently proposed, whether it is entirely within the west side of the VELCO corridor. And Ms. Simollardes can respond to that.

THE WITNESS: So during the lunch break we went back and double checked, and there are in fact two locations where the current alignment, the -- is on the eastern side of the VELCO corridor. One is at line less roughly 6869 for 200 feet. The other is at line less 7201 for about 50 feet. And we are right up against the eastern edge of the VELCO corridor and maybe a little bit in it on those two locations.

MR. COEN: So I guess that raises a question for me. As to if this is a problem with VELCO, in terms of their wanting to CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 BY MS. LEVINE:
- 2 O. Good afternoon, Ms. Simollardes.
- 3 A. Good afternoon.
- 4 Q. I have a few questions I want to follow up on
- 5 on your surrebuttal first since you were just talking
- 6 about that.
- 7 A. Okay.
- 8 Q. Looking at your surrebuttal Exhibit 1.
- 9 A. Which I left -- yes, I have it.
- 10 Q. Okay. You identified that to you -- my
- 11 recollection, is in order to use the VELCO corridor you
- would likely have to do HDD to bore underneath portions of
- 13 that right of way to protect natural resource areas; is
- 14 that correct?
- 15 A. Not just -- in some cases it would be for
- 16 natural resource areas. In others it would be to protect
- 17 the integrity of the pipe. For example, that longitudinal
- 18 stream would be both to not alter the stream but also to
- 19 the protect the pipe from erosion over time.
- 20 Q. And the distances that would -- that you would
- 21 anticipate using HDD, which I don't know what HDD stands
- 22 for?
- 23 A. Horizontal directional drilling.
- 24 Q. Thank you very much. Horizontal directional
- 25 drilling, those are roughly commensurate with the lengths CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 or the distances of HDD that you're doing in other parts
- of the Addison Natural Gas Project; correct?
- A. If you're asking is that an exceptionally long
- 4 drill, no. There are drills that are of that length and
- 5 there is drills that are shorter.
- 6 Q. Okay. And it's similar to the length and the
- 7 magnitude of drilling that you've agreed to in your
- 8 Memorandum of Understanding with the Agency of Natural
- 9 Resources.
- 10 A. I believe it is.
- 11 Q. In terms of using the VELCO corridor versus
- 12 using other property, I think your testimony was that
- 13 VELCO requested you not use the east portion of their
- 14 right of way?
- 15 A. VELCO had requested that we not locate the
- 16 pipe on the eastern side of the VELCO corridor. They had
- 17 also indicated that the western side was not a preference
- 18 either. But it was not an absolute no.
- 19 Q. Okay. And for instance, the Palmers have also
- 20 requested you not put the pipeline through their property;
- 21 correct?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. So they are in the same situation that VELCO
- 24 is in?
- 25 A. I think they are in a slightly different CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 situation than VELCO is in. If your point is both parties
- 2 have requested, I agree with that. Both parties have
- 3 requested that the pipeline be in a different location.
- 4 Q. Okay. Now I'll go back to my original
- 5 questions. Do you have your prefiled testimony in front
- 6 of you?
- 7 A. I do.
- 8 Q. Now you did not provide a resume or a
- 9 curriculum vitae with your testimony. I just wanted to
- 10 ask you a few questions about your background. You're not
- 11 a climate scientist; is that correct?
- 12 A. I am not.
- 13 Q. You don't have any specific expertise on
- 14 climate change; is that correct?
- 15 A. I do not.
- 16 Q. And your testimony regarding greenhouse gas
- 17 emissions relies on studies or work that others have done;
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. And then I have a few questions regarding your
- 21 testimony concerning the Integrated Resource Plan. You
- 22 address that on pages 10 to 11 of your direct testimony.
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Now as I read your testimony on page 10, the
- 25 bullets that you list there on page 10, do you see those? CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Are those the factors that in your opinion
- 3 show that the project is consistent with least cost
- 4 planning?
- 5 A. I think those factors do indicate a
- 6 consistency with least cost planning.
- 7 Q. And Vermont Gas Systems has not done any
- 8 additional least cost planning analysis; is that correct?
- 9 A. Specific to this project or in general?
- 10 Q. Specific to this project.
- 11 A. I'm not sure I agree with that
- 12 characterization, because we have entered into several
- 13 settlements with different parties, and as part of
- 14 consideration for those settlements, we are looking at
- 15 various costs and benefits associated with entering into
- 16 those settlements or not entering into those settlements.
- 17 But we have not done further pipeline analysis beyond
- 18 what's here.
- 19 Q. Okay. And the Vermont Gas Systems' least cost
- 20 analysis evaluated gas compared only to oil or propane; is
- 21 that correct?
- 22 A. For this project, yes.
- 23 Q. And this issue was raised by one of the
- 24 commenters at the public hearing last week. So you did
- 25 not evaluate, for instance, biomass or heat pumps; CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 correct?
- A. We did not assume that the loads that this
- 3 project will serve would otherwise have been served by
- 4 biomass or heat pumps. We based it on the current market
- 5 and the composition of the current market, roughly 70
- 6 percent fuel oil, 30 percent propane. We also did not
- 7 adjust our loads for the impact of energy efficiency going
- 8 forward.
- 9 Q. And did you provide any analysis of the amount
- 10 of either biomass, ground source heat pump, renewables or
- energy efficiency going forward 20, 30, 40, 50 years?
- 12 A. In our Integrated Resource Plan we did provide
- 13 additional information on the level of energy efficiency
- 14 investments that will occur over the next 20 years. We
- 15 did not do an analysis of biomass or heat pump. Nor did
- 16 we do the reverse of that. Recognizing that today fuel
- 17 oil has a price advantage over propane. We didn't take
- 18 into any -- take into account the fact that current
- 19 propane users but for this project may someday switch to
- 20 fuel oil instead. We used the current market and the
- 21 current footprint.
- 22 Q. So the commenter at the public hearing
- 23 identified an analysis in another New England state that
- 24 found that new generation of electrically powered heat
- 25 pump and biomass systems rivaled customer cost efficiency CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 for natural gas, but you did not look at that; correct?
- 2 A. We did not look at that. Nor can I comment on
- 3 the veracity of that statement because we didn't look at
- 4 it.
- 5 MS. LEVINE: That's all I have. Thank
- 6 you.
- 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Mr. Saudek,
- 9 do you have questions for this witness?
- 10 MR. SAUDEK: One or two. In your --
- 11 MR. COEN: Do you want to go up to the
- mic, please?
- 13 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MR. SAUDEK:
- 15 Q. In your analysis of --
- 16 A. I'm sorry. I can't hear you.
- 17 Q. In your analysis of the lower greenhouse gas
- 18 effects, switching over to natural gas, to what extent did
- 19 you take into account the laws relating to transition to
- 20 low sulfur oil, biodiesel, propane, that sort of thing?
- 21 Did you take into account those laws in Vermont?
- 22 A. No. I did a very simple burner tip analysis
- 23 of natural gas versus home heating fuel and propane. I
- 24 did not do an adjustment for different types of fuel oil
- 25 that may have more bio content. However, Mr.--CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. I'm not going to ask you that.
- 2 A. Okay.
- 3 Q. Another witness.
- 4 A. I did not.
- 5 Q. And that would -- would you concede that that
- 6 would change your result?
- 7 A. Yes, that would change my result. Depending
- 8 on the assumption that you made about the acceptance of
- 9 alternate fuel types.
- 10 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Mr. Saudek, I don't
- 11 think your mic is on. Oh, I guess it is.
- 12 You need to speak into it more.
- MR. SAUDEK: I'll try to speak up, Mr.
- 14 Chairman.
- 15 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. Thank you.
- 16 BY MR. SAUDEK:
- 17 Q. In response to one of the information requests
- 18 that we made of you, you said that Vermont Gas has seen
- 19 information indicating methane released into the
- 20 atmosphere has by volume approximately 21 times the global
- 21 warming potential than does carbon dioxide by volume. Do
- 22 you remember that?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you take that into account in your
- 25 calculations?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. As I stated, I did a very simple burner tip
- 2 analysis of the greenhouse gas reductions, and that is
- 3 consistent with the analysis that the Board has accepted
- 4 in other 248 proceedings including Vermont Gas's most
- 5 recent looping Docket or the LNG proceeding for OMYA. It
- 6 has been used for energy efficiency. All I did was
- 7 replicate that.
- 8 Subsequent to that when that appeared issues
- 9 were raised about it not being life cycle, we retained an
- 10 expert -- climate expert to do a life cycle analysis. My
- 11 numbers were simply burner tip, and they were never
- 12 purported to be anything other than burner tip.
- 13 Q. And you never, as you answered Ms. Levine, you
- 14 never purported to be an expert in that field?
- 15 A. Absolutely not.
- 16 Q. Did you -- this is the same question I asked
- 17 Mr. Gilbert. Did you make any attempt to find out what
- 18 sort of leak rate -- methane leak rate there would be on
- 19 the system delivering -- that ultimately delivers to
- 20 Vermont Gas?
- 21 A. We did two things. One is we retained an
- 22 expert that does have the credentials to do the analysis
- 23 that I do not have.
- Q. Well you didn't at the beginning, right?
- A. No. I didn't. Consistent with past Board CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 practice, I stuck with end use emissions. That's what we
- 2 have done on our energy efficiency analysis. That's what
- 3 we did in our most recent 248 for our transmission system
- 4 expansion, and it's what's been accepted in other Board
- 5 proceedings. So no, I did not.
- When it became an issue, we retained somebody
- 7 that could. The other thing I did is I went back and I
- 8 looked at our Department of Transportation reports that
- 9 report the leaks on our system and confirmed that we don't
- 10 have leaks on our system. And I took a look at our
- 11 unaccounted for gas, and confirmed that it was at the low
- 12 end of the industry average, and that's as far as I took
- 13 my analysis.
- I relied on Mr. Bluestein's analysis to do the
- 15 full life cycle.
- 16 Q. On the price of natural gas, do you expect
- 17 that if exports of natural gas increase substantially from
- 18 the United States out to other countries, the price of
- 19 natural gas will go up?
- 20 A. I think the price of natural gas is set by an
- 21 myriad of factors, including production, local demand,
- 22 international demand, weather. I'm also not going to set
- 23 myself up as an expert on what would happen to the
- 24 wholesale price of gas. It could go up in that scenario,
- 25 but it could also be offset by other factors that would CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 cause it to go down.
- 2 What I did do is I took a look at the Energy
- 3 and Information Administration's various price scenarios.
- 4 While we relied on one scenario for our forecast they in
- 5 fact did a multiple different scenarios. And in each of
- 6 those scenarios natural gas retained its competitive
- 7 position against the alternate fuels. Because as Mr.
- 8 Gilbert testified, as it pertains to the economics of this
- 9 project, the absolute price of natural gas is not as
- 10 critical as the relative price of natural gas to the
- 11 alternatives.
- 12 Q. And in your experience have you seen a lot of
- 13 fluctuation in energy prices in various kinds of energy?
- 14 A. Sure. I mean I took a look at what has
- 15 happened over the past decade of wholesale prices. And I
- 16 believe there is -- in my rebuttal testimony -- that both
- 17 fuel oil and natural gas have experienced price
- 18 volatility, but the natural gas price volatility was about
- 19 half of that experienced by fuel oil.
- 20 And over that decade I believe we had a
- 21 competitive advantage over fuel oil in all but three
- 22 percent of the time. So I've taken a look backwards and
- 23 I've taken a look forward, and I don't see anything
- 24 compelling that would argue that the relative price of
- 25 natural gas to alternatives is going to be materially CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 different than what we put forth in this case.
- 2 Q. And that would be regardless of whether the
- 3 state or federal governments decided to alter the way
- 4 natural gas is brought out of the ground for environmental
- 5 reasons.
- A. Well I think it's important to remember that
- 7 those regulations apply not just to the production of
- 8 natural gas, but also to the production of fuel oil and
- 9 propane. So again, it's not the absolute price of natural
- 10 gas that's important. It's the relative price of natural
- 11 gas to fuel oil and propane that decides the economics of
- 12 this project.
- MR. SAUDEK: I have nothing further.
- 14 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Mr. Diamond.
- 15 MR. DIAMOND: Yes. I believe the
- 16 Addison County Regional Development Corp.
- 17 may --
- 18 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Did you have questions?
- 19 MR. LOUGEE: I do have a couple of
- 20 questions that I requested earlier this
- 21 morning.
- 22 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. Go right ahead.
- 23 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 24 BY MR. LOUGEE:
- Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Simollardes. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Good afternoon.
- 2 Q. Are you familiar with the supplemental
- 3 testimony of Tim Bouton, and in particular the Memorandum
- 4 of Understanding between Vermont Gas and Addison County
- 5 Regional Planning Commission?
- 6 A. I am.
- 7 Q. Okay. Did you sign the MOU on behalf of
- 8 Vermont Gas?
- 9 A. I did.
- 10 Q. Okay. Can you confirm that the MOU accurately
- 11 reflects the agreement between Vermont Gas and the Addison
- 12 County Regional Planning Commission?
- 13 A. It does.
- 14 Q. Can you confirm the MOU requests that the
- 15 Board incorporate the conditions in the MOU and into any
- 16 final order the Board issues?
- 17 A. I agree with that.
- 18 MR. LOUGEE: No further questions.
- 19 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Mr. Diamond.
- MR. DIAMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 21 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 22 BY MR. DIAMOND:
- Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Simollardes. Do you also
- 24 have in front of you an exhibit identified Monkton SP-2?
- 25 A. Not yet.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. I can certainly -- I have an extra copy if
- 2 that would be helpful.
- A. I do have it with me. I just don't have it in
- 4 front of me yet.
- 5 Q. If I may approach.
- 6 A. I have it.
- 7 O. And in this case Vermont Gas reached a
- 8 Memorandum of Understanding with the Town of Monkton; is
- 9 that correct?
- 10 A. We did.
- 11 Q. And does Monkton SP-2 accurately reflect that
- 12 Memorandum of Understanding?
- 13 A. My copy is not labeled, so is that the MOU?
- 14 O. Yes.
- 15 A. Yes. It does.
- 16 Q. And you executed this document on behalf of
- 17 Vermont Gas as its representative agent?
- 18 A. I did.
- 19 O. And in this MOU this addresses a number of
- 20 concerns that the Town had including the siting of the
- 21 proposed pipeline within the Town of Monkton; is that
- 22 correct?
- 23 A. Yeah.
- Q. And in particular, would you agree that the
- Town of Monkton had a preference or a goal to ensure that CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 the pipeline was placed at least 300 feet from existing
- 2 residential homes and wells?
- 3 A. That was the -- one of the objectives that
- 4 Monkton expressed a desire to honor to the extent possible
- 5 within this Memorandum of Understanding.
- 6 Q. And would you agree as well that the MOU
- 7 addresses issues such as the provision of a distribution
- 8 network within the town?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And methods of construction and the size of
- 11 the transmission pipeline?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Does it also address conditions with regard to
- 14 times for construction, blasting procedures, and testing
- 15 of wells?
- 16 A. It does.
- 17 Q. As well as conditions regarding the placement
- 18 of the pipeline on agricultural lands?
- 19 A. It does.
- Q. And does it also represent an agreement with
- 21 regard to indemnification for property owners in the event
- 22 of damage resulting from construction and/or blasting?
- 23 A. It does.
- 24 Q. And is Vermont Gas -- is it correct that
- 25 Vermont Gas is requesting that the terms and conditions of CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 this MOU be incorporated into a final order by the Public
- 2 Service Board?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. Is it also correct that Vermont Gas is
- 5 requesting that the CPG, if issued in this Docket, be
- 6 conditioned upon Vermont Gas's compliance with the terms
- 7 and conditions therein?
- 8 A. That's also correct.
- 9 MR. DIAMOND: In conjunction with the
- 10 witness's testimony we seek the admission of
- 11 Exhibit SP-2, although we intend to offer it
- as well through Mr. Pilcher and his prefiled
- 13 testimony.
- 14 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Is there any objection?
- MS. HAYDEN: No objection.
- 16 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: All right. It's
- 17 admitted.
- 18 (Exhibit SP-2 was
- 19 admitted into the record.)
- 20 BY MR. DIAMOND:
- 21 Q. Ms. Simollardes, you had -- in your
- 22 surrebuttal had talked about the potential availability of
- 23 a conservation easement near the Palmer property; is that
- 24 correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

- 1 Q. And that easement is westward of the Palmer
- 2 residence; correct?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. And in order to even explore that option you
- 5 would need to be a co-applicant with the Palmers?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. And to the best of your understanding are the
- 8 Palmers aware that they would have to be a co-applicant?
- 9 A. I believe they are.
- 10 Q. And are you aware whether or not the Palmers
- 11 have ever expressed to you an interest in being a
- 12 co-applicant for such an application?
- 13 A. The Palmers have not expressed to me that they
- 14 would be interested in being a co-applicant. They have
- 15 expressed a desire for the pipeline to be located on the
- 16 VELCO corridor. They did give us a right of entry to
- 17 explore for archeology that westernmost portion of the
- 18 corridor. But that was not -- that was not --
- 19 MR. COEN: Westernmost portion of the
- 20 corridor or --
- 21 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. The western-
- 22 most portion of their property where the
- 23 conservation easement is located.
- MR. COEN: Thank you.
- 25 THE WITNESS: But they did not indicate CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 whether or not they would be co-petitioners
- 2 for an easement -- an amendment to that
- 3 easement.
- 4 BY MR. DIAMOND:
- 5 Q. Looking at the exhibit that you presented
- 6 earlier, Petitioner's Surrebuttal EMS-1, I believe.
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And maybe it would be helpful, I don't know if
- 9 you want to refer to the big poster board for the benefit
- 10 of the Board.
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. But I just want to confirm with your testimony
- 13 earlier that it's possible with horizontal direct drilling
- 14 you could add an additional 40 feet beyond the current
- 15 pipeline layout vis-a-vis the Palmer residence; is that
- 16 correct?
- 17 A. That's correct. This segment right in here,
- 18 and I'm pointing to a spot that is just about due west of
- 19 the Palmer property, could be horizontally directionally
- 20 drilled which would allow the pipe to be 40 feet further
- 21 west, so 40 feet further away from the Palmer property.
- 22 Q. So that would make for a total of 165 feet?
- 23 A. Approximately. Yes.
- Q. Approximately. And if for whatever reason the
- 25 Board determines that the location of the pipeline had to CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 go back into the corridor, the VELCO corridor that is, on
- 2 the westerly side, do you have some measurements of
- 3 people's homes in proximity to that VELCO corridor on the
- 4 western side?
- 5 A. There are two homes shown on this exhibit.
- 6 One is approximately 75 feet from the edge of the VELCO
- 7 right of way consistent with our collocation; other places
- 8 where we are 10 feet within the VELCO right of way, that
- 9 home would then be within 85 feet of the pipeline. The
- 10 other home is 100 feet from the edge of the VELCO
- 11 corridor, so it would be 110 feet away from the pipeline.
- 12 And the third is a well that would be within
- 13 about 60 feet of the pipeline.
- 14 Q. And with regard to the two homes that you were
- 15 just referencing, that's approximately near pole 187 and
- 16 pole 188 or marker 187 and 188 just to give a proximity to
- 17 this example?
- 18 A. The first one that's 75 feet is approximately
- 19 by structure 187. The other appears to be right in
- 20 between 188 and 189.
- 21 Q. And in this exhibit did you look to determine
- 22 whether there might be any residential wells associated
- with the property near 187?
- 24 A. I did not. The only well that's located --
- 25 noted on here is the McGinnis well. Somebody from VHB, CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 maybe Mr. Nelson, would know whether or not there are
- 2 other wells there.
- 3 Q. Okay. And likewise for the property with --
- 4 that's between 188 and 189. You didn't look to determine
- 5 if there was a well that might be impacted?
- 6 A. Correct, I did not.
- 7 Q. And should the property -- should the line be
- 8 located to the eastern side of the VELCO corridor, are
- 9 there two other properties that might be within that
- 10 vicinity of that pipeline?
- 11 A. There are. One which looks like it's about to
- 12 the right, I don't know if that's east or south. I guess
- 13 it's southeast of line 187 would be about -- would be
- 14 about 45 feet from the pipeline.
- The other structure right at the turn, so if
- 16 you went due -- whichever way from structure 190, would be
- 17 about 25 feet from the pipeline.
- 18 Q. And likewise were these properties -- did you
- 19 look to determine whether or not there were wells
- 20 associated with these residences?
- 21 A. I did not.
- 22 Q. And is it fair to say that based upon the
- 23 numbers that you've just articulated that the distances
- 24 between the potential pipeline that would go through the
- 25 VELCO corridor, do you have that in mind? CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 O. Is closer -- its residents would be closer
- 3 than the Palmer property is under either the current
- 4 proposal or if you added another 40 feet?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- 6 MR. DIAMOND: With the Board's brief
- 7 indulgence --
- 8 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Sure.
- 9 MR. DIAMOND: Nothing further.
- 10 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Yes, Mr.
- 11 Sciarrotta?
- MR. SCIARROTTA: Yes, VELCO just has a
- few questions based on Ms. Simollardes' --
- her testimony this afternoon.
- 15 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: The live surrebuttal?
- MR. SCIARROTTA: Yes.
- 17 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay sure. Go ahead.
- MR. SCIARROTTA: Okay.
- 19 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 20 BY MR. SCIARROTTA:
- 21 Q. So Ms. Simollardes, good afternoon.
- 22 A. Good afternoon.
- 23 Q. You've testified that where the alignment for
- 24 the pipeline is going to be in the VELCO corridor, that
- 25 with the exception of crossings on the VELCO corridor, CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 that it will be located about 10 feet inside from the edge
- 2 of the VELCO right of way?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. Okay. And that for that alignment the
- 5 pipeline will essentially run parallel to the edge of the
- 6 VELCO corridor?
- 7 A. That's correct.
- 8 Q. Okay. And in the company's original plans
- 9 submitted in December, on December 20th, the Vermont Gas
- 10 had proposed putting the pipeline in the dog leg area of
- 11 the VELCO corridor. That's on your surrebuttal exhibit;
- 12 is that correct?
- 13 A. If the dog leg area is essentially from the
- 14 deep ravine to structure 190, we were on the eastern side
- of the VELCO corridor in that 12/20 alignment working our
- 16 way towards the western side of the VELCO corridor, ending
- 17 up at the western side somewhere in the vicinity of 190.
- 18 Q. Okay. So it's fair to say that for that area
- 19 the original proposal would bisect the VELCO corridor on a
- 20 diagonal path versus being parallel to the easterly side
- 21 of the VELCO corridor?
- 22 A. It wasn't a straight parallel. I would need
- 23 Mr. Heintz to speak more specifically. But I believe your
- 24 characterization is correct.
- MR. SCIARROTTA: Thank you. That's all CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 I have.
- CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Mr. Palmer,
- do you have questions?
- 4 MR. PALMER: Thank you.
- 5 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 6 BY MR. PALMER:
- 7 Q. Hello Eileen. Other than yesterday when you
- 8 called our house, it's been quite awhile since we have
- 9 chatted about this project. How long has it been?
- 10 A. Since you and I spoke?
- 11 Q. Yeah.
- 12 A. Outside of casual conversations at various
- 13 public hearings, which you've attended all of them, and I
- 14 believe we spoke at all of them, I think the last time you
- 15 and I spoke formally about this was when Mr. Gilbert and I
- 16 came out and visited your home. I put the exact date of
- 17 that in a discovery response. I don't have it. You
- 18 probably know it better than I do.
- 19 Q. How many times have you been out to our
- 20 property?
- 21 A. I have been to your home twice.
- 22 Q. And both times you were invited?
- 23 A. Actually the very first time I approached you
- 24 at one of the first prehearing conferences on this case, I
- 25 had not met you. I introduced myself to you out in the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 hallway before the Board hearing and said I would like to
- 2 sit down with you and got your contact information and
- 3 originated the meeting from there.
- 4 Q. And actual times visiting the farm we invited
- 5 you out?
- 6 MR. COEN: Can you pull the mic closer
- 7 or speak up, Mr. Palmer?
- 8 BY MR. PALMER:
- 9 O. And we have been civil?
- 10 A. You've been civil.
- 11 Q. Thank you. Now after VGS violated the right
- 12 of entry agreement that was signed in May, you called and
- 13 spoke with Jane on the phone. What was the content of
- 14 that phone call?
- 15 A. I called to apologize for the violation of the
- 16 right of entry. And in that, I explained what had
- 17 happened. That it was a subcontractor of Vermont Gas, an
- 18 archeological subcontractor that was on the property
- 19 beyond the term of the right of entry.
- 20 Q. Did you indicate whether or not Vermont Gas
- 21 would be considering the alternative route that we had
- 22 proposed in that conversation?
- 23 A. I told you that we were looking at the
- 24 archeology in that alternative route in that conversation.
- 25 And I'm -- I guess I'm not clear on when you mean by CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 considering. We have looked at it. We have priced it.
- 2 And we still believe that for the totality of reasons I
- 3 described this morning, in my live surrebuttal testimony,
- 4 that the route across your property is the appropriate
- 5 one.
- 6 As I said last night, I feel very badly that
- 7 it doesn't work for you. But it does appear to be for the
- 8 totality of reasons, the appropriate place to locate that
- 9 pipe.
- 10 Q. So before this proceeding, since then there
- 11 has been no indication of whether or not you would use
- 12 that alternative route.
- 13 A. I'm sorry. I can't hear you.
- 14 Q. I say since -- other than before today, there
- 15 has been no indication as to whether or not you would use
- 16 that alternative route or not. There has been no
- 17 communication to us about that; correct?
- 18 A. Our communications with you have been that we
- 19 believe that the location on your land of the pipe is the
- 20 appropriate place to be. And that is also consistent with
- 21 our Memorandum of Understanding with the Town of Monkton.
- 22 Q. My point is there has been no direct
- 23 communication with us as to whether you would accept
- 24 alternative route or not that we pointed out?
- As I explained this morning, the challenge CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 with the alternative route, besides cost, is that it is
- 2 encumbered by a conservation easement. And that is not
- 3 certain that we would be able to be amended to allow the
- 4 pipe constructed there.
- 5 Q. And that has not been relayed to me until
- 6 these proceedings now is my point. True?
- 7 A. I don't know that. I will take your word for
- 8 it. I did not tell you that. I will agree with that.
- 9 O. Well --
- 10 A. Actually I need to correct that. I don't
- 11 believe that that is true. I think when we were out
- 12 looking at your farm, Mr. Gilbert and I, that we talked
- 13 about the challenges of that conservation easement when we
- 14 were out walking in the field. I think we did talk about
- 15 that.
- 16 Q. That was before we gave you the right of
- 17 entry?
- 18 A. It was.
- 19 Q. So you've stated in your rebuttal on page
- 20 three lines nine to 10 that VGS is working with individual
- 21 parties to seek mutual resolution to issues and concerns
- 22 that have been raised. As landowners aren't we parties?
- A. You are.
- 24 Q. So how are we seeking to work out these
- 25 resolutions if we are not talking about them until we get CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 to here?
- 2 A. Your questions have been about me talking to
- 3 you. I know that there have been other folks associated
- 4 with Vermont Gas that have been out. We have had
- 5 engineers that have looked at your property as well. And
- 6 we do not have a signed right of entry to evaluate the
- 7 location where we are proposing to put the pipe to see
- 8 whether or not -- we have been doing this -- we think we
- 9 could HDD -- we could move it 40 feet closer from looking
- 10 at maps.
- 11 We do not have the right of entry to go out
- 12 and look at that land from a full environmental and
- 13 engineering perspective.
- 14 O. I have not heard about HDD across that line
- 15 until yesterday.
- 16 A. Agreed. Agreed. Because -- I know that this
- 17 process has been incredibly frustrating for you. And it's
- 18 a really difficult process for an individual landowner to
- 19 participate in. I acknowledge that.
- 20 When we were looking at your rebuttal
- 21 testimony and the testimony of your witnesses, and
- 22 particularly talking about the hydrology, I don't even
- 23 know who came up with the idea that said, you know, if we
- 24 HDD'd it we might be able to address some of these issues.
- 25 I said that's not a bad idea. Let's take a look at that. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 It's -- the process is iterative. It's not
- 2 done until the pipe is put in the ground.
- 3 Q. So you agree your communication with the
- 4 landowners is a little lacking?
- 5 A. I agree that our communications with you have
- 6 not met the expectations that you would like. I agree
- 7 with that.
- 8 Q. Now in your filing on 12/20 at that point
- 9 horizontal directional drilling was okay, but now it's too
- 10 expensive?
- 11 A. I didn't say it was too expensive. I said it
- 12 was more expensive.
- 13 Q. Why do you think that we put that property
- 14 into the WRP?
- 15 A. I don't know why you put it in. Presumably to
- 16 preserve the wetlands.
- 17 Q. Yes. It was. Do you know where the
- 18 Latreillles' spring is located?
- 19 A. I'm sorry. The Latreilles?
- 20 Q. Latreilles' spring.
- 21 A. I do not.
- 22 Q. You have been talking about springs. That's
- 23 definitely not on here.
- 24 A. I don't know where it's located.
- Q. Are there other houses on this route that are CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 within 300 feet of that pipe?
- 2 A. There are. And I need -- I want to be careful
- 3 about the term setback. Vermont Gas has not agreed or
- 4 conceded that a 300 foot setback is necessary or
- 5 appropriate. What we have done is, to the extent
- 6 possible, honored the desires of a community to have such
- 7 a distance. It's not -- there is no setback requirement.
- 8 Q. Why couldn't you have brought this
- 9 illustration to us before this time instead of wasting our
- 10 time here at the Board?
- 11 A. This was not designed to waste anybody's time.
- 12 It was designed to help frame the conversation.
- 13 Q. Conversation has been lacking for quite
- 14 awhile. So is VGS still maintaining that this pipeline
- 15 easement will not affect the value of our property?
- 16 A. We do not have any information that shows the
- 17 presence of a pipeline decreases the value of a landowner.
- 18 Notwithstanding that, that is one of the reasons why you
- 19 pay a landowner for the right to use their land. We are
- 20 not putting pipe on there and not compensating the
- 21 landowner. There is compensation that accrues to the
- 22 landowner for the right of the pipe to be there.
- I've used my own neighborhood as an example
- 24 several times. I live in Manley Commons in Milton.
- 25 Vermont Gas Systems' 10-inch transmission line runs right CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 through the middle of that neighborhood, right smack dab
- 2 through the middle of it. There are homes in my
- 3 neighborhood that are within 30 feet of that transmission
- 4 line, and they are appraised at the same value as the
- 5 other homes.
- 6 We were at a public meeting in Shoreham and an
- 7 appraiser stood up and said he had asked the tax listers
- 8 and other municipalities whether or not they
- 9 differentiated when they were appraising the values of the
- 10 home for the presence of a transmission line. And he had
- 11 been told no. I'm not going to tell you that somebody --
- 12 you're not going to find somebody that said I wouldn't buy
- 13 a house that's got a transmission line on it, any more
- 14 than you find somebody that says I wouldn't buy a house
- 15 that has an electric line, or I wouldn't buy a house that
- 16 was on top of a mountain because you can't get cable.
- 17 There is all sorts of reasons why people don't want to
- 18 purchase property.
- 19 Q. So if it's not having an effect on my value,
- 20 why do you offer compensation at all?
- 21 A. Because we are limiting your use of that land.
- 22 You cannot erect a structure over the easement after we
- 23 acquire it. You can farm it, you can put a driveway
- 24 across it. Across it, not longitudinally. But you can't
- 25 grow trees on it, and you can't erect a structure on it. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 153

- So we are, in fact, limiting a landowner's use
- of that land to some degree, and that's what the
- 3 compensation is for.
- Q. Can you put septic on that easement?
- 5 A. You can't put a septic over the pipe. Whether
- 6 or not it could go within the 50-foot easement, I would
- 7 defer to Mr. Heintz or Mr. Teixeira.
- 8 Q. So basically you're saying that there is not
- 9 an effect on the property owner value wise, so you're
- 10 obviously not figuring any loss of property value in any
- 11 of your project -- in any of your projections, is that
- 12 true?
- 13 A. We are -- I believe that's what I said.
- 14 Q. Listening to your quotes on savings that the
- average homeowner says you're going to be up to \$2,000 per
- 16 person, it seems rather high.
- 17 A. I don't agree that it is. It's going to vary.
- 18 The individual customer saving will vary depending on the
- 19 level of usage they use.
- The only thing I can point to is the
- 21 Department of Public Service's Fuel Price Reporter which
- 22 has the average price of fuel oil, the average price of
- 23 natural gas, and the average price of propane, and I can
- 24 compare that to the usage we see. And we are seeing
- 25 savings over 20 percent.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 We have recently expanded into Richmond, and
- 2 within one year we have 58 percent of that footprint
- 3 converted. If the savings weren't there I don't think we
- 4 would see that conversion rate. And that's before the low
- 5 income rate which adds another 20 percent on top of that.
- 6 I am not going to look at any customer and guarantee them
- 7 2,000 savings. It will vary dramatically with what they
- 8 use. Somebody that only converts to natural gas to run
- 9 their dryer, they are not going to save \$2,000 a year.
- 10 Somebody that converts their water heater, their home
- 11 heating, they could save \$2,000 a year. Depending on the
- 12 size of the home.
- 13 Q. So on your greenhouse gas emissions do I have
- 14 it correct that this is basically savings about one
- 15 percent off from the greenhouse gas emissions?
- 16 A. One percent from what?
- 17 O. From what the total state's behind the
- 18 greenhouse gas emissions, this is a reduction of
- 19 approximately one percent; is that correct?
- 20 A. I did not calculate how much -- what the
- 21 reduction would be as a percent of the state's greenhouse
- 22 gas emissions, but frankly there is a huge target out
- there for greenhouse gas reductions, and I don't think we
- 24 are in a position to say no to even a small amount.
- Q. My local fuel dealer offers 12 different CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 155

- 1 choices. Six of those are biofuel. How many choices will
- 2 you have with this project?
- A. By choices do you mean rate offerings?
- 4 Q. How many different products will you offer?
- 5 A. We will offer the sale of natural gas, so I
- 6 would call that one offering. It is available under a
- 7 variety of different tariffs for a residential customer.
- 8 For residential customers there is one rate tariff. We
- 9 are in discussions with the biomethane developer about
- 10 whether or not the feasibility of having a partially
- 11 renewable natural gas tariff that would have the
- 12 biomethane in it.
- 13 Q. But it's basically one choice?
- 14 A. Well you asked me what choices we would have.
- 15 If you're talking about for the purchase of natural gas, a
- 16 residential customer has one tariff today with a -- the
- 17 potential of two. There are other service offerings that
- 18 Vermont Gas has that a customer's not obligated to take
- 19 but would be available.
- MR. COEN: Ms. Simollardes, I think the
- 21 question was what product do you have. Fuel
- 22 dealer has several products including I
- guess a couple different biofuels.
- 24 How many products does Vermont Gas offer
- from its pipeline?

 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

 (800/802) 863-6067

Page 156

- 1 THE WITNESS: From our pipeline today we
- offer one, the sale of natural gas, and we
- 3 are working with the biomethane developer to
- 4 have a second.
- 5 BY MR. PALMER:
- 6 Q. So you don't offer a renewable -- a renewable
- 7 product?
- 8 A. We do not offer a renewable product today.
- 9 Q. How many landowners are on board with this
- 10 now? How many easements do you have?
- 11 A. This is not a current count. But I believe as
- 12 we sit here today we have 43 percent of the entire route
- 13 secured, and another 32 percent in active negotiation.
- Q. So I'm not the only hesitant one?
- 15 A. Excuse me?
- 16 Q. I'm not the only hesitant landowner?
- 17 A. You are not the only landowner that has not
- 18 signed an easement. That's correct.
- 19 Q. I asked Don Gilbert this question once before.
- 20 Can you guarantee that Vermont Gas will always be
- 21 competitive with fuel oil?
- 22 A. I can't quarantee that. But as I said in
- 23 response to a different line of questioning, I've looked
- 24 backwards for a decade, and there were only three percent
- of the time on a monthly basis that we were not less CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 expensive than fuel oil. I've looked forward using the
- 2 EIA information under a variety of scenarios and all of
- 3 them had natural gas at a competitive advantage to fuel
- 4 oil. I cannot guarantee that.
- I do point out, however, that customers choose
- 6 to use their energy product for a variety of reasons, and
- 7 price is only one of them. Some people really like the
- 8 convenience of not having to schedule deliveries. Other
- 9 people like the fact that we are regulated. Other people
- 10 like the fact that they are going to have access to energy
- 11 efficiency programs. So no, I can't guarantee it.
- If we were not competitive with fuel oil it
- doesn't necessarily mean that customers would not choose
- 14 to use our product.
- 15 Q. Now CLF had requested a copy of the easement
- 16 agreement from you in your first round of discovery. You
- 17 objected. We asked for a copy in our second round of
- 18 discovery. You sent me a memo and an option for an
- 19 easement.
- Is there some reason why you don't want me to
- 21 see the actual easement agreement?
- 22 A. I believe we sent you the easement agreement
- 23 as well. There is absolutely no reason why anybody can't
- 24 see the easement agreement.
- Q. All I saw was an option for an easement.

 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. I will check that discovery response.
- 2 Q. Thank you.
- 3 A. Those option agreements are widely circulated.
- 4 The easement agreements rather.
- 5 Q. So do you believe this is a done deal?
- 6 A. Looking around this room, no.
- 7 Q. Just curious why you're opening offices down
- 8 in Middlebury --
- 9 A. Because --
- 10 O. -- if it's not a done deal?
- 11 A. We are not opening offices down in Middlebury.
- 12 We are recruiting for staff in Middlebury. Because there
- is a significant lead time associated with making sure
- 14 that the day the pipe -- the valve is turned and the gas
- is flowing, we are ready to honor our service commitments
- 16 and serve Addison County customers with the same level of
- 17 service that Franklin and Chittenden County get. And we
- 18 take that obligation very seriously.
- 19 It's in no way an indication that we think
- 20 it's a done deal. It's planning.
- 21 Q. So you are expecting it to go?
- 22 A. I'm hoping for it. I think this is a really--
- 23 obviously I think that this is a really, really good deal
- 24 for Vermont and hoping the Board approves this. We have
- 25 put a lot of time and effort into it, and I've said this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 before, I know we disagree on this, but I believe with
- 2 every fiber of my being that this is a good deal for
- 3 Vermont. And we would be remiss in not planning for its
- 4 success.
- 5 MR. PALMER: Thank you. I'm done.
- 6 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Mr. Palmer, so you've
- 7 concluded your questions?
- MR. PALMER: I have.
- 9 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: I would just like for
- 10 the record -- for clarification of the
- 11 record, whatever Ms. Simollardes thinks is
- 12 -- doesn't matter to me. The company can't
- go forward unless we give approval, and we
- 14 certainly haven't made a decision.
- 15 It's not a done deal as far as we are
- 16 concerned.
- MR. PALMER: Thank you, sir.
- 18 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: I wanted people to be
- aware of that. I would also like the record
- to reflect you signed up for 10 minutes but
- 21 you actually took around 20 or 25 minutes,
- and I have no problem with that. People
- have complained about us not being
- 24 accommodating, and I wanted to be clear that
- we were happy to accommodate you in your CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

22 O. Is that better?

23 A. I can hear.

Q. You were discussing energy efficiency with Mr.

25 Palmer just now.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Does Vermont Gas operate an energy efficiency
- 3 program?
- 4 A. Yes. We have been offering energy efficiency
- 5 programs since about 1992. We were recently designated an
- 6 Energy Efficiency Utility by the Public Service Board to
- 7 continue offering natural gas energy efficiency programs.
- 8 Q. And to your knowledge is energy efficiency
- 9 itself considered a product?
- 10 A. A product? I consider it a service offering.
- 11 I don't know if I would consider it a product.
- 12 Q. Okay. An offering?
- 13 A. A service offering that Vermont Gas has.
- 0. Okay. All right. Thanks. Back to the Rotax
- 15 Road reroute.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. We have talked a good bit about the alignment
- 18 as proposed today which goes across the Palmers' property
- 19 and is in their immediate yard. We have talked about a
- 20 return to the VELCO right of way. And then we have
- 21 mentioned this area to the west which is burdened by a
- 22 federal conservation easement.
- 23 A. Correct.
- Q. And I've heard you say that that is not a
- 25 preference of Vermont Gas because there is uncertainty. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. It's not a preference for Vermont Gas for two
- 2 reasons. One that would need to be horizontally directly
- 3 drilled at approximately cost of 850,000. That land is a
- 4 wetland. We are confident that we can construct without
- 5 impacting the wetland by horizontally directly drilling,
- 6 but that said, if you can avoid it, why not.
- 7 And the uncertainty as to the outcome of the
- 8 easement amendment process both as to time and ultimate
- 9 outcome.
- 10 Q. And could you explain that a little more?
- 11 What is your understanding of how long it takes to get an
- 12 approval or a rejection?
- 13 A. Well I'm not sure that the Vermont office has
- done this before. But it does include a NEPA review,
- 15 which requires it to go out to public comment. It
- 16 requires that there is not another alternative. And we
- 17 have heard estimates of anywhere from just under a year to
- 18 just over three years depending on the nature of the
- 19 amendment being offered.
- 20 But again Vermont Gas doesn't have any
- 21 experience on that, and I'm not sure the Vermont office of
- 22 the wetland folks have done this. This is based on
- 23 amendments for other easements in other jurisdictions.
- Q. Okay. So your inability to know that you
- 25 would be in a position to use the property could affect CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 your construction schedule?
- 2 A. It could affect the construction schedule.
- 3 And we are not in, you know, quote; a hurry to construct
- 4 for the heck of it. We are in a hurry to construct
- 5 because the first phase of this brings gas service to the
- 6 Middlebury Industrial Park where the largest customers are
- 7 located, including Agri-Mark. And there is significant
- 8 savings to those customers, and a year's delay is real
- 9 dollars to them.
- 10 That's why we would like to construct this
- 11 project next year so we could bring natural gas service to
- 12 the Middlebury Industrial Park in late 2014, and then go
- 13 back and construct the distribution networks within
- 14 Vergennes and Middlebury in 2015 so those customers would
- 15 have access to gas service winter '15, '16.
- 16 Q. Okay. Thank you. We have heard some talk
- 17 today about lost and unaccounted for gas. Could perhaps
- 18 you explain what that is a little more?
- 19 A. I'll do my best, and then if there is more
- 20 questions, Mr. Teixeira would be the appropriate person to
- 21 answer that.
- 22 Essentially lost and unaccounted for gas is
- 23 the difference between the measured volume of gas that we
- 24 purchase at the border and Vermont Gas purchases all of
- 25 its gas at the Vermont border at our gate station in a CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 location called Philipsburg, essentially the U.S./Canadian
- 2 border. And it's the difference between that value and
- 3 the sum of all of our customers' meters.
- 4 So right away unless you could instantaneously
- 5 read every meter exactly at the same time as you were
- 6 reading your border meter, you're going to have a
- 7 difference simply because of timing. Meters by definition
- 8 have slight inaccuracies in them. They can go one way or
- 9 the other.
- 10 There could be heating content differences, we
- 11 purchase our gas in Canada in GJ, gigajoules, and we sell
- 12 in MCF, so there is conversion differences there. And
- 13 then there is company use which is the amount of gas that
- 14 we use in some of our gate stations, not all of which is
- 15 metered.
- And there could be what is known as fugitive
- 17 methane. My opinion is the last one is a very small
- 18 number because we track our leaks, and at the end of the
- 19 year if you look at our DOT reports, we do not have any
- 20 open leaks. We fix them all. And we also report to the
- 21 Environmental Protection Agency under their greenhouse gas
- 22 reporting system known colloquially as EGRIT, and those
- 23 numbers also show a very low level of fugitive gas
- 24 emissions.
- 25 Q. So the unaccounted for portion of that phrase CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 is relevant. It's not all --
- A. It truly is unaccounted for. It's exactly
- 3 what it says. It's the difference between what we bought
- 4 and what we sold.
- 5 Q. Okay. Let's talk about the cost of the
- 6 project a little bit.
- Were you here this morning when Mr. Gilbert
- 8 talked about that?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And I believe his testimony, perhaps your
- 11 testimony as well, the initial estimate was approximately
- 12 84 million.
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. And the current working estimate, if you will,
- is around 86.6 million?
- 16 A. That's correct. The 12/28 alignment and Mr.
- 17 Heintz's testimony of 12/28 and his testimony of June 28 I
- 18 believe all speak to an 86.6 price tag.
- 19 Q. And you have entered into MOUs with several of
- 20 the parties that are in this case?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. And those MOUs reflect both benefits and cost
- 23 to VGS?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Could you maybe just outline real quickly the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 MOUs? Just run down the ones, because I think some have
- 2 been entered into since your rebuttal testimony.
- 3 A. So we have entered into a Memorandum of
- 4 Understanding with the Town of Monkton, Monkton School
- 5 District, the Ag group which is comprised of Vermont Land
- 6 Trust, Vermont Housing Conservation Board and the
- 7 Department of Agriculture. Addison County Regional
- 8 Planning, Agency of Natural Resources and VELCO.
- 9 O. And some of these trade-offs to reach
- 10 agreement you have perhaps done reroutes, other things
- 11 that have affected your cost?
- 12 A. Some of these memorandums are simply
- 13 affirmations of what was already in our testimony,
- 14 confirming that we were going to abide by our
- 15 environmental regs, or confirming that we were going to do
- 16 a specific landscaping scheme at a gate station.
- Others, for example, the MOU with Agency of
- 18 Natural Resources, we have agreed to horizontally
- 19 directionally drill two additional locations, the cost of
- 20 which is not reflected in the 86.6 that we talked about a
- 21 moment ago. Others have discussion about service
- 22 commitments that will require an investment in some cases
- 23 gate stations, small gate stations, and in all cases
- 24 distribution mains.
- Those are not part of this project nor do I CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 necessarily think they should be. They would be rolled
- 2 into our standard feasibility and covered that way. Those
- 3 are -- if you're talking about overall expenses -- those
- 4 in fact have costs associated with them, but they are not
- 5 directly in this proceeding and part of that.
- 6 Q. Okay. Other than the changes that have
- 7 occurred in the project itself over time, due to those
- 8 MOUs, et cetera, have there been cost differences that are
- 9 attributable to other things that you're aware of?
- 10 A. Yes. For example, and again, Mr. Heintz, Mr.
- 11 Teixeira, or Mr. Howe is better able to speak to the
- 12 specifics, but the Department of Public Service's safety
- 13 witness has some recommendations about the type of pipe,
- 14 and the type of class construction we should do, which
- 15 have some cost ramifications to them as well.
- We are constructing this project to class
- 17 three conditions throughout the whole thing even though
- 18 some segments of it are class one and class two.
- 19 Q. Okay. Your cost estimates, do they reflect
- 20 all of the transmission and distribution line that will be
- 21 necessary to serve businesses and residents in Middlebury
- 22 and Vergennes?
- 23 A. The 86.6 doesn't. The 86.6 is the
- 24 transmission main line and the distribution main line to
- 25 Vergennes and Middlebury. The networks within Vergennes CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 and Middlebury are not in that number. But that number is
- 2 referred to in Mr. Gilbert's testimony, I think Mr. Carr's
- 3 testimony and my testimony.
- I'm now -- actually I won't do it from memory.
- 5 I'll look it up. One second please. When you add the
- 6 distribution networks within those two communities, the
- 7 project at the 86.6 cost is 92.9. And the economic
- 8 analysis and the savings were all done including the
- 9 distribution networks.
- 10 Q. So six million or so? Is that --
- 11 A. Oh, it would have been helpful -- yes. The
- 12 distribution are 6.3 million excluding the cost of
- 13 services and meters which were in fact included in all of
- 14 our analysis and are not broken out separately here. I
- 15 didn't roll them up, because the cost of services in
- 16 meters grows over time as the market penetration grows.
- 17 Q. Okay. Now I would like to turn to the system
- 18 expansion fund for just a moment. Are you familiar with
- 19 that Docket? I believe it was 7712?
- 20 A. I am.
- Q. Okay. My understanding is that at some point
- 22 in time Vermont Gas is going to seek permission from the
- 23 Board to use the money that's sitting and growing in that
- 24 fund?
- 25 A. That's correct. We are intending to do so CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 with our 2014 base rate filing.
- 2 Q. And what was the purpose of the fund?
- 3 A. The purpose of the fund was Vermont Gas at
- 4 that time had what we thought was an incredible
- 5 competitive advantage. It was 25 percent. And as we sit
- 6 here now it's 40 plus. We have had several rate
- 7 reductions in a row. I'm doing this part from memory, but
- 8 I think it was 10 and 11 quarters or nine and 10 quarters.
- 9 And we were getting ready to have an additional rate
- 10 reduction as part of our quarterly PGA of about 5.4
- 11 percent.
- 12 We had been hearing increasingly from
- 13 stakeholders is there any way to extend natural gas
- 14 service to more parts of the state. This is a very rural
- 15 state. We need a transmission spine to serve basically
- 16 anything outside of our existing footprint. And we had
- 17 the thought that rather than reducing rates for either a
- 18 tenth or 11th time, we would take that 5.4 percent what
- 19 otherwise would have been a rate reduction, we would put
- 20 it aside in a reg liability, a regulatory liability, and
- 21 use it to help smooth the rate effect of expansion into
- 22 markets that on their own couldn't justify the 41 miles of
- 23 transmission pipe that are required.
- I should point out that the Vergennes and
- 25 Middlebury markets, if they were located like where CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 170

- 1 Richmond is or Enosburg or Hinesburg, the network within
- 2 those communities supports the investment within the
- 3 communities. It is really the need to bring that
- 4 transmission line 41 miles closer to those communities
- 5 that was driving the need for that transmission -- for the
- 6 System Expansion Reliability Fund.
- 7 So we approached the Board about being able to
- 8 do so. We explained the benefit to Franklin and
- 9 Chittenden County by the ability to back feed our existing
- 10 system, the fact that greenhouse gases and environmental
- 11 attributes don't stop at county lines. So sort of the
- 12 rising tide raises all ships. So as Addison County goes,
- 13 there will be a ripple benefit in Chittenden County.
- 14 And we explained the fact that long-term
- 15 Vermont Gas would like to serve the Rutland market and
- 16 someday hook into the system -- the U.S. system so we had
- 17 choices as it pertained to our supply. The Board weighed
- 18 those considerations and agreed to allow us to put that --
- 19 those monies aside subject to oversight. And they were
- 20 very clear that they were not authorizing us to actually
- 21 spend any money, nor were they authorizing the preapproval
- 22 in any shape or form of any given project. It was simply
- 23 a funding mechanism that we could use to smooth the rate
- 24 impact that may otherwise be associated with expansion
- 25 into rural areas.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 171

- 1 Q. Okay. In this proceeding, in this 248
- 2 proceeding, are you asking the Board to bless, if you
- 3 will, any particular method of taking money out of the
- 4 fund?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Are you asking the Board to allow you to use
- 7 the fund for any construction?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Are you seeking recovery of any cost
- 10 associated with the project in this proceeding?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. And are you seeking the Board's approval for
- any specific rate treatment in this proceeding?
- 14 A. No.
- MS. PORTER: That's all we have for Ms.
- 16 Simollardes.
- 17 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: All right. Thanks.
- 18 MR. BURKE: Ms. Simollardes, I noticed
- that in response to a question from the
- Department you said that the benefits don't
- 21 stop at the county lines. And costs,
- including maybe environmental costs, do they
- stop at county lines or even state lines for
- 24 that matter?
- THE WITNESS: It depends on the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-606/

	Page 172
1	environmental attribute you're talking
2	about. Obviously air quality doesn't stop
3	at a town line or a city line or state line.
4	MR. BURKE: Thank you.
5	MS. TIERNEY: Good afternoon, Ms.
6	Simollardes.
7	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
8	MS. TIERNEY: I am looking at page 12 of
9	your rebuttal testimony. If you could go
10	there. In that passage you're discussing
11	Mr. Palmer's testimony regarding the
12	potential impact of the project on his
13	farm's possible organic certification.
14	Do you see that?
15	THE WITNESS: I do.
16	MS. TIERNEY: Have you had occasion to
17	review the exhibits attached to Mr. Palmer's
18	rebuttal testimony?
19	THE WITNESS: I have.
20	MS. TIERNEY: And do you perhaps recall
21	the article that was attached as exhibit
22	Palmer Rebuttal 2? Pipelines, Power Lines
23	and Organic Farms?
24	THE WITNESS: I recall it. I will not
25	profess to have a working knowledge of that CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

rebuttal testimony or his direct testimony? Got it.

MS. TIERNEY: You've got it.

THE WITNESS: I do.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TIERNEY: His rebuttal testimony to answer your question.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MS. TIERNEY: So as I understand it Mr. Palmer's concerned that putting the pipeline across his property would conceivably impact his organic farm certification or his prospect of obtaining one.

And I understand the company's response to be well we have our own grounds for believing that he need not be concerned about that. Is that basically where we are? When the -- that is where THE WITNESS: CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

we are. When the organic -- the potential impact on organic farm certification or the potential for the Palmers to ultimately have their farm certified as organic was raised, we asked VHB to evaluate that for us. We actually made an outreach to the Ag Department as well, who are not the folks that actually deem a farm organic, so I understand that they would not necessarily be the definitive authority on that.

But we did ask VHB to look into the criteria for organic certification and whether or not anything about the pipeline was incompatible with that. Mr. Nelson's memorandum is attached to my rebuttal. I am not the organic expert by any stretch of the imagination. The only thing I do know is the -- there are several farms in the Intervale area that are organic, and are our pipeline coexists with them.

MS. TIERNEY: I seem to recall an exchange in discovery between you and Mr. Palmer on that very point. And the impression that remained with me on that was that Mr. Palmer pointed out there was one CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

for instance, required you to come up with

25

such a plan and to do so in consultation
with people like the Palmers.

THE WITNESS: I think it would be fair to say that Vermont Gas's construction practices should not -- should ensure that organic farm's status is not compromised.

MS. TIERNEY: There is also a provision in that plan that speaks to compensation for demonstrated damages to crops, for instance, in event that were to happen. I would ask you -- I think it's toward the end of that plan -- if you could have a real quick look at that.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I don't have my glasses. My arm's not long enough. I don't -- there is the compensation piece. It's actually on page 34 above that. And it basically says compensation will be based on crop yield and/or crop quality determinations.

We are in the -- as we are negotiating individual easements with landowners, particularly landowners that are actively farming, we are including crop damage compensation in those easements. There is CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

-- I should actually have Mr. Heintz speak to this, but globally or generally speaking, there is a value that is set by I believe the UVM Ag Department for various crops.

And we are estimating the acreage that we are disturbing and compensating based on that formula.

MS. TIERNEY: Now listening to that here I would take that to mean that you've given thought to conceivably offering compensation for crops that had been corrupted due to construction.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MS. TIERNEY: Let's go one step further. What about crops that have been displaced or will not have been sown permanently because of the effects of the pipeline if such an effect were demonstrated? Have you given that any thought?

THE WITNESS: That is a far more difficult task because you are trying to predict what otherwise may have happened to land without necessarily any evidence that in fact the land would be used for that.

People -- we have had people tell us things CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

mitigation would be possible. It doesn't

25

	Page 180
1	actually say you cannot do this. It says
2	steps need to be taken.
3	MS. TIERNEY: But in turn those steps
4	might fit into the plan that I am sitting up
5	here and asking you whether you would be
6	interested in drafting such a plan.
7	THE WITNESS: Correct.
8	MS. TIERNEY: Is that correct?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.
10	MS. TIERNEY: I have no further
11	questions. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thanks.
13	MR. YOUNG: Good afternoon, Ms.
14	Simollardes.
15	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
16	MR. YOUNG: Let's start with some easy
17	stuff.
18	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I like the
19	harbinger, but go ahead.
20	MR. YOUNG: No, short and sweet.
21	THE WITNESS: Okay.
22	MR. YOUNG: Let's start with some of the
23	MOUs that are outstanding. I'll get the
24	right binder here. First, you have the
25	agreement with Addison County Regional CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

damage or adverse impact caused by the

challenge would be actually demonstrating that the issue with the well was caused by Vermont Gas. In the Town of Monkton -- although my understanding of the blasting plan is we are going to be doing pre-blast surveys of all the wells so we would have a baseline.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Let me try to recharacterize what you just said. As a matter of principle you don't like additional conditions, but in terms of this particular commitment, it doesn't really bother you, is that a fair characterization?

THE WITNESS: I don't think I said it wouldn't bother me. What I think I said is I think it would be a challenge for Vermont Gas to deny somebody if we had damaged their well somehow within 300 feet that we wouldn't treat them the same way as we were treating somebody in Monkton. I think this would be a challenge for us not to apply the same condition up and down the 41 miles.

think we need to make the condition

ubiquitous. You think there is enough of an
CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: And therefore you don't

THE WITNESS:

I actually don't have that

continue.

Advanced training will be required. We are -- we will make sure in our training with all the fire departments and first responders that it includes anything that would be specific to the transmission line.

The last bullet is the sophisticated metering equipment. That's the same issue that we just spoke to -- or about with Addison County Regional Planning. We have a transmission line today that runs from the Highgate border to Burlington, and we did not buy this kind of equipment.

We are not sure that we agree with that statement. The follow up that we have had with Williston, this is from the Williston Fire Department, Williston Fire Department letterhead. But with regard to the Town Manager, Mr. McGuire, most of the follow up with Mr. McGuire is really about how to extend service to other parts of the town in conjunction with this project.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.

THE WITNESS: So I would say two of the three I'm confident that have been resolved.

The third I'm not sure we agree with. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1 MR. YOUNG: The third is the type of equipment we were talking about with the	
2 equipment we were talking about with the	
± ±	
3 Addison County Regional Planning Commission.	
4 THE WITNESS: Exactly.	
5 MR. YOUNG: Let me move to a different	
6 set of topics. In your testimony, and	
7 unfortunately I didn't mark it on my notes	
8 as to whether it's rebuttal or direct,	
9 you'll remember because you used it earlier.	
You said there are three months since 2004	
11 where the price of natural gas has been	
12 above fuel oil and/or propane. Correct?	
13 THE WITNESS: Correct. I should that	
14 was my rebuttal testimony. I will find	
15 that.	
MR. YOUNG: It's at page eight. Did	
mark the page number down. Just didn't mark	
18 which one.	
19 THE WITNESS: And I should want to be	
careful when I say price. This was as	
21 reported by the DPS's Fuel Price Reporter.	
I'm not talking about wholesale prices, and	
I'm not talking about necessarily prices	
24 across all rate classes.	
This is the DPS Fuel Price Reporter. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067	

part of the other conversation we are having

with the biomethane developer is what to do with the rest.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And there is a couple of different models that could unfold. One is Vermont Gas could just buy it and put it in our portfolios, and I would liken that to more the SPEED kind of model where you take the output and you just roll it in, and it's part of your PGA with everything else.

The other model would be what I've called the Cow Power which is Vermont Gas still buys it, but we stream it directly to customers who are interested in purchasing that type of service. As we sit here right now we are leaning towards the optional Cow Power type of approach for that biomethane. There is not a -- the project's not built. The developer is still working on things. But we have -- we are in active discussions with both Middlebury College as it pertains to how are we going to sell them a service that's blended by methane and natural gas and with the developer around the construction of the facilities needed and what's going to happen with the excess CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1 output from that digester.

MR. YOUNG: It will be interesting to see you try to market a higher level of gas, but -- so are we expecting to see a real proposal in this area within, you know, within the next couple years or --

THE WITNESS: To a certain extent the timing of this is not driven by Vermont Gas. But yes, I believe the Board would see at least one, if not three different arrangements related to this.

The first would be a special contract between Vermont Gas and Middlebury College. Because they are going to have one meter and two types of gas flowing through it. So they are going to have a blend of interruptible sales, service where they are buying the molecules from us, and an interruptible transport service where they are buying the molecules from the biomethane developer.

So we don't have a tariff that's a hybrid right now, transport in sales, so that would be a special contract. And then the other two possibilities are that we CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

would have a supply contract with the 1 2 biomethane developer that we would submit to 3 the Board for approval under 248. Presume that it met either the peak-day criteria or 5 the length criteria. And the third would be 6 if we go down the Cow Power path you would 7 have tariffs with the biomethane required on 8 them that would need to be approved. 9 timing of that is really dependent on the

biomethane developer right now.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COEN: There is a lot of cow manure in Franklin County. Are you going to be offering the same kind of a tariff up in Franklin and Chittenden Counties and producing some kind of a developer -- and have a developer up there as well?

THE WITNESS: We would love to do that.

As a matter of fact the very first time we talked to the biomethane developer it was in fact for a Franklin County based farm. He has moved his efforts down to Addison

County. But if this works, frankly, you know, we would love to have every cow in Vermont put their output in our pipe. If we could.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

1 MR. YOUNG: Next topic. Energy
2 efficiency. I will try to use less of that
3 gas you're producing.

Energy efficiency. My understanding is part of your proposal you're extending the energy efficiency programs to the newly served or the areas that you're proposing to serve; correct?

THE WITNESS: Well that's correct. Our objective is to make sure that Addison

County customers receive the same level of service with the same quality as Franklin and Chittenden Counties. And offering our energy efficiency programs is a core service offering of Vermont Gas's current Franklin and Chittenden County customer footprint, and we will continue that obligation and service offering in Addison County.

MR. YOUNG: Same plans, no changes?

THE WITNESS: I can't say that. We are in the middle of the second phase of a Board proceeding, Docket 7676, around becoming a designated Energy Efficiency Utility or an EEU. Part of that will be the need to go through a DRP, a Demand Resource Plan, which CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

weatherization side of our program.

We have a really high uptake on 1 3 5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

customers converting to natural gas from fuel oil and propane from participating in our programs particularly in the equipment replacement program. The customer that chooses to replace their heating system with a higher efficiency system can participate in the programs, get a rebate for purchasing a high efficiency system, and then get financing for the rest of it at zero cost. We have a pretty high uptake on that. And then we have this sort of new market to go after in terms of weatherization, an area that's really been historically under served.

MR. YOUNG: Well you just jumped on my next question which is exactly that. you're moving into -- the Department's made recommendations for more robust energy efficiency programs, and I'll certainly ask Mr. Poor a few questions about that when he gets a chance.

But I guess since you're moving into a new area as you described they haven't had a weatherization program available, the same CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

way that you provide one. Obviously there
are weather weatherization programs and
there is the open market.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

MR. YOUNG: Doesn't it make sense to focus more resources as you go in there to take advantage of the opportunities that really in what may be an underserved area? Now I realize I'm presuming that it may be underserved.

THE WITNESS: Well I don't know -- I don't want to prejudge the outcome of the DRP process in 7676. I agree with your statement as it pertains to sort of the classic lost opportunity of equipment replacement. And yes, we should get every single person that wants to replace their heating system with a high efficiency one. I would love to get them to participate in our energy efficiency programs. And we are not putting any sort of artificial constraints on the budget or anything like that.

I would -- it would be great if they would all participate. The place that I CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

think we are pausing and saying well what

will it look like is the retrofit program

and the timing of customers getting audits

and weatherizing their homes, and we need to

look at -- that's a much bigger commitment

for even a customer to do.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Let me let you channel your inner Tim Lyons. And we will move to some of Mr. Lyons' testimony.

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Before we move on to a new line of questioning, why don't we take our afternoon break, and we will resume at 3:30. Thank you.

(Recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: I guess we would like to get started again if everybody is ready. I have a couple of announcements. We were being asked by the Vermont Housing, is that -- Vermont Land Trust, excuse me, about their witness Miller. None of the parties had questions for him. And they wanted to know if we did, or if he could be excused. And I think we are pretty confident that he could be excused. So I think you can pass that on to Mr. Miller. That would be CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

Ticonderoga is on line 19 of that same page
MR. YOUNG: Right. And including
Ticonderoga it's a much bigger increase in
sales.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YOUNG: I guess I'm curious because a few minutes ago you said the growth you were expecting was about equal to, you know, a couple years' worth of increase in your CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

renewal, and we could let that slide.

So we did in fact acquire incremental capacity, but it hasn't locked us into thinking anything because we have a piece of capacity that's very flexible on year-to-year renewal.

MR. YOUNG: When you were doing your cost models on the cost of the project did you include the incremental cost associated with the greater capacity on TCPL?

THE WITNESS: Actually the incremental capacity on TCPL is actually lower cost than our existing capacity on TCPL. How we modeled this is we assumed that the customers in Addison County would pay the same weighted average cost of gas or WACOG that our existing customers would pay.

In fact, the Addison County customers if we were to look at the overall load profile and/or allocate them, the short-haul piece, the overall cost of gas may be slightly less than our existing market, but we are not planning on having zoned rates. It's sort of all in postage stamp rates.

So I think the assumption for economic CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

	Page 203
1	modeling purposes that the WACOG for Addison
2	County is the same as the WACOG for
3	Chittenden County was reasonable.
4	MR. YOUNG: Okay. So you just built it
5	into your cost of gas as opposed to
6	THE WITNESS: Correct.
7	MR. YOUNG: to a capital charge or a
8	capacity charge.
9	THE WITNESS: Correct.
10	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Several questions
11	about the agreement with IP. The testimony
12	states that the FDA requires a hundred
13	percent recovery of the IP lateral costs and
14	50 percent of the Addison upgrade; is that
15	correct?
16	THE WITNESS: Correct.
17	MR. YOUNG: That's I believe on page 15.
18	THE WITNESS: That is actually I'm
19	sorry. Can you point me to the reference?
20	MR. YOUNG: I believe that's on page 15
21	of the testimony.
22	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Mr. Lyons' testimony?
23	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Lyons' testimony.
24	Starting at line two.
25	THE WITNESS: And the agreements with CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

International Paper, there is actually two.

There is a facilities development agreement and a service agreement. For the service agreement they are expected to purchase natural gas from Vermont Gas under a Board approved tariff. What the sentence on line two means is that the facilities development agreement provides for recovery of one hundred percent of the lateral cost and 50 percent of the Addison upgrade and Addison extension cost.

If IP takes service from Vermont Gas for the duration of those agreements, IP will cover one hundred percent of all of the costs associated with the IP lateral, the Addison upgrade and the Addison extension costs, by virtue of the distribution component of the tariff that they will take service on for interruptible gas sales.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Is the service agreement transportation charge the vehicle for recovering all of the costs that IP is going to be paying, or is there an up front component?

THE WITNESS: The facilities development CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

for for termination of service after service

approximately what, 20 million dollars; is CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

24

	Page 20
1	that correct?
2	THE WITNESS: No. Actually hang on.
3	Let me not guess. I'll just double check
4	that. What the Addison extension and
5	Addison upgrade costs will be will depend on
6	the actual cost of the project as installed.
7	For planning purposes, in this document, the
8	Addison upgrade is 20 million dollars and
9	the Addison extension 24 million dollars.
10	And that can be seen on Exhibit TSL-9, and I
11	need to point out that that map for TSL-9 is
12	not a routing map. It's a cost allocation
13	map that's designed to show the different
14	buckets of cost recovery that International
15	Paper would be responsible for.
16	It is not a routing map of where the
17	subsequent phase of this project will be
18	constructed.
19	MR. YOUNG: The result of that is if
20	International Paper takes service and
21	cancels within a short period for whatever
22	reason
23	THE WITNESS: For whatever reason.
24	MR. YOUNG: then the potential exists
25	for VGS ratepayers to be on the hook for CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

hundred percent of this.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

	Page 209
1	They have a contract. There is benefit
2	to the contract for them, but even if in a
3	scenario where they don't and they
4	terminate, at worst, at worse, Vermont
5	customers are better off because
6	International Paper will have paid for 25
7	percent of the facilities that we need to
8	serve Rutland. I'm sorry, 25 percent of the
9	of these facilities that we need to serve
10	Rutland.
11	There is still pipe that we need to get
12	further south that IP is not paying for.
13	MR. YOUNG: Right. Okay. I want to
14	turn next to financial, a couple financial
15	questions.
16	THE WITNESS: Am I back to me, or am I
17	still Tim?
18	MR. YOUNG: I think you're you.
19	THE WITNESS: Okay.
20	MR. YOUNG: It's actually not in your
21	testimony though. It's in what we discussed
22	this morning, and I believe it was marked as
23	Board 1, or was going to be marked as Board
24	1. And you had kindly offered to get a
25	copy, you or one of your representatives. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

years you're just about to break even but

	Page 21
1	still not there.
2	THE WITNESS: Right. I just realized
3	this only goes to 18. It doesn't go to year
4	20. I suspect we might be just there at
5	year 20. It looks like it's declining
6	500,000 or so a year. Maybe year 20 would
7	be a breakeven, but the last year of the
8	fund is what's on here, and the revenues are
9	not yet covering the cost of service for
10	that market.
11	MR. YOUNG: Okay. The return I'm
12	looking at appears to go to year 20. But
13	this is Exhibit 1-1.1. Am I looking at the
14	right one?
15	THE WITNESS: You are. I was looking at
16	a different page of it. The back page the
17	use of the fund doesn't go to year 20.
18	You're right, it does.
19	MR. YOUNG: It looks like at year 20
20	you're close but still not under.
21	THE WITNESS: That's right.
22	MR. YOUNG: Typically now this
23	comparison is comparing incremental revenues
24	to carrying costs; correct?
25	THE WITNESS: No. It's comparing CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

incremental revenues to the total cost of service including carrying cost, so it includes gas costs, it includes some amount of administrative expenses, but the bulk of it is carrying cost, yes.

MR. YOUNG: And you once again tripped me up on my imprecise language. That's what I intended to say but didn't.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

MR. YOUNG: No, we have a long history of you correcting me, and unfortunately not without good cause.

Okay. So when you typically look at line extensions, and by you obviously I mean VGS, is that the analysis you often do which is comparing the incremental revenues to the -- essentially the annual cost of service associated with the incremental facilities?

THE WITNESS: We actually do something very similar but on a shorter time horizon.

Mr. Gilbert started to speak to that this morning. When we do a line extension review or a system footprint review, we do a cost of service. Actually we normally exclude gas costs on the argument that the

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

incremental cost, but I feel like in this case since there was so much around sort of the energy savings, it was better to have the gas cost component of it contained within the model.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But normally if we are looking at an Enosburg or a Richmond, we do a cost of service excluding gas costs. We look at it over a 10-year basis, and we see whether or not the revenues from the new market will cover the cost of service on a net present value 10-year basis. We do not require that the revenues on a 10-year net present value basis meet or exceed the incremental cost.

What we do is we look at everything on a blended basis, and what we are trying to assure is that our investments in a given year in aggregate meet or exceed the authorized rate of return to avoid upward pressure on rates. So the concept is the same, the time line is different.

This is a 20-year model, and we have historically been using 10-year models.

MR. YOUNG: So your last statement was a reference to avoid upward pressure on rates. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

So has your criteria traditionally on line extensions really been avoiding upward pressure on rates?

THE WITNESS: It's been a balance act between the desire to expand gas service to incremental markets to bring the benefits of natural gas lower prices, economic development, environmental attributes, et cetera, to -- so we are balancing the need of potentially new customers with the needs of our existing customers to still pay attention to burner tip price competition. And so we won't, you know, run our line up the top of a mountain or other places.

So we have always tried to balance growth potential with existing market potential. And this project was really a step outside of that. And that was driven as much by the need to construct 41 miles of transmission spine as anything else. I said this earlier; if Vergennes and Middlebury were located in Chittenden or Franklin County, that standard of the distribution mains within our market -- it would have passed that traditional screening. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 216
1	MR. YOUNG: Right. Assuming you could
2	air lift the gas there which is
3	THE WITNESS: Right.
4	MR. YOUNG: which is the increment.
5	Your facilities that you're putting in
6	place, typically, you know, your analysis is
7	20 years, you have the ability to serve gas,
8	40, 50 years with these facilities, correct?
9	THE WITNESS: Correct.
10	MR. YOUNG: So is it reasonable to say,
11	and I'll look at your 1-1.2 scenario, after
12	15 years you're actually getting
13	contribution from these customers which over
14	the life of the project probably produces
15	should produce a net plus. Or is likely to.
16	THE WITNESS: If you're talking about
17	over the economic life of the pipe, I
18	suspect that is true. I haven't net present
19	valued it beyond the 20 years. But there is
20	an and by the way the carrying costs in
21	these exhibits were all predicated on a
22	55-year depreciation rate. These facilities
23	were not depreciated over 20 years for the
24	purpose of this analysis. We matched more
25	closely what we expect would happen from a CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1 rate perspective.

There is a couple of conservative assumptions in these exhibits. One is we use the existing footprint. We made no assumptions about underlying economic growth in that market. So if there were 3,000 customers there today, this analysis is done on 3,000 customers. We didn't say gas is going to be the next best thing since sliced bread, and those counties are going to grow gangbusters, in spite of the fact we have heard some testimony about that. It's always based on the existing footprint so there was no underlying growth.

The other thing we did is we used a fairly conservative saturation rate as compared to our experience in our new markets. I believe I started with a 40-percent saturation rate in year one, and it doesn't reach 60 percent until year five. But this year in Richmond we were at 58 percent after one year. So there are other things that could move these economics for us or against us.

The project could cost more and that CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1	would put a squ	ueeze. Custome	rs could use
2	more or less.	The saturation	could be
3	better. There	is things that	could move it.

MR. YOUNG: I understand lots of variables; your energy efficiency programs could produce more ability for benefits.

THE WITNESS: That's right, that's right.

MR. YOUNG: The effect of this seems to be that over the long-term, and I'll use the .2 examples, because that includes the revenues from International Paper. Over the long term your revenues exceed your costs, but over the short term you have essentially existing ratepayers of VGS paying a higher cost that again if they stay in the house 40 years they get back, are expected to get back, but they don't over the next 10 years. Why is that okay?

THE WITNESS: I think this was one of the issues that the Board addressed in approving the System Expansion Reliability Fund. As we sit here right now with International Paper, we are not anticipating any additional rate impact from our existing CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

customers even over the short term. We would instead use a System Expansion

Reliability Fund to mitigate that rate impact. And as we explained in the fund Docket, we think it's okay for a couple of reasons.

One is in a rural state that's how infrastructure gets done. There is other examples besides pipe where the expansion of infrastructure has been done sort of on an across-the-board basis whether it was as Mr. Gilbert mentioned, the Rural Electrification Act, or it's the highways that we all pay for, or it's our broadband, infrastructure tends to be spread across a broader pool.

Then there is the issue of that existing customers will benefit from this. Maybe not in the form of rates, but we know that the construction of the Williston gate station provides additional reliability for existing customers. Mr. Teixeira can speak to that, not me. We know that in a small state the economic fortunes of different counties are closely linked, so if Addison County has the economic benefit here that we are expecting, CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

reluctant to just say yes and stop there,
because I don't know that I could give you a
laundry list of what those might be. But
it's intuitive to me that there would be
some. And some of them may be indirect.

You know, if we are a larger company, do you have access to different lenders that are more excited about you because you're a bigger company. If you're buying more gas do you have more people that might want to talk to you. I think it would be difficult to quantify some of those, but intuitively I think there would be some benefits of economy of scale.

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: I'm actually going to switch topics, and we will go back to where you started the day which is a couple siting issues.

First you mentioned in talking about the Palmer property, you were talking about the option that had been turned up recently of doing a short-distance bore; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, a horizontal CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

we barrelled down past all the trees you

were going to cut down. And have you had an opportunity to address that? I brought that up on the site visit as well.

THE WITNESS: Yes, we were out -- I want to say we, Vermont Gas, it was not me, but we went out with Mr. Hurlburt on Old Stage Road. Right now we are on the eastern side of Old Stage Road. And we had a conversation this morning about how we are only on the western side of the VELCO corridor except for there were two small locations in Williston.

Last week VELCO approached us and said in that one location on Old Stage they would be amenable to us moving to the eastern side of their right of way there. So we have looked at that route with Mr. Hurlburt, and it may be possible to move just past -- I don't have -- I should have a map. I don't have a picture of that.

MR. COEN: We have the map here for you.

THE WITNESS: The natural resources map

would be JAN 2 I think it is.

MS. HAYDEN: Mr. Coen, because the Board's raised this this morning -- because CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1	the Board raised this this morning, we did
2	have a natural resource map prepared that
3	would show what Ms. Simollardes is
4	explaining. It was just brought in a little
5	after lunch.
6	T had planned to have Mr. Heintz walk

I had planned to have Mr. Heintz walk through that. It hasn't been marked, but I can certainly mark it quickly and provide that to the Board members and others here.

The only concern --

MR. COEN: Go ahead.

MS. HAYDEN: The only concern I have is I'm not sure there is enough copies for everybody here.

MR. COEN: Why don't we -- if I could just have a general description from Ms. Simollardes, and then we can defer the rest to Mr. Heintz. That will be fine.

MS. HAYDEN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: It does appear it would be possible to move to the other side of Old Stage Road, on the eastern side of the VELCO corridor, right around I believe mile post 29, which is not the full duration that Mr.

Hurlburt was looking for. But it is a CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

Okay.

THE WITNESS:

	Page 227
1	MR. YOUNG: So as far as you know those
2	issues are now largely resolved for Mr.
3	Baldwin.
4	THE WITNESS: I don't know that all of
5	Mr. Baldwin's issues are resolved. I
6	believe the issue relative to the access
7	road is resolved, and we are having
8	productive conversations about the terms of
9	the easement.
10	MR. COEN: The easement across Mr.
11	Baldwin's property, does it follow the VELCO
12	line completely, or is there a deviation
13	from there? That's what I was told when I
14	asked the question of Mr. Pughe.
15	THE WITNESS: I'm going to defer that
16	question to Mr. Heintz. I don't remember
17	off the top of my head.
18	MR. COEN: I asked that question on the
19	bus, and I was told it did. But I want to
20	verify it under oath here.
21	THE WITNESS: Then we should have I
22	don't have the map.
23	MR. COEN: I will talk to Mr. Heintz.
24	THE WITNESS: That would be good. Thank
25	you. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

	Page 228
1	MR. DUDLEY: Good afternoon, Ms.
2	Simollardes.
3	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
4	MR. DUDLEY: I just wanted to jump back
5	for a moment and ask you a couple of
6	clarifying questions. On a conversation you
7	just had with Mr. Young concerning your
8	response of September 12 which is now Board
9	Exhibit 1.
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	MR. DUDLEY: Do you still have that?
12	THE WITNESS: I do.
13	MR. DUDLEY: I'm also going to make
14	brief reference to one of your exhibits from
15	your December prefiled testimony, and that's
16	Exhibit EMS-2.
17	THE WITNESS: Yes.
18	MR. DUDLEY: Now just so I understand
19	what your projections in attachment 1-1.1
20	and 1-1.2 represent, 1-1.1 represents your
21	revenue requirement without the inclusion of
22	International Paper; is that correct?
23	THE WITNESS: Correct.
24	MR. DUDLEY: And 1-1.2 is with
25	International Paper? CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

THE WITNESS: It's with International Paper, but with the facilities development agreement prorated to reflect only that component of the facilities development agreement that's related to the 20 million dollar Addison upgrade as opposed to Exhibit EMS-2, the estimated fund withdrawals there which assumes International Paper but all in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067		1490 223
agreement prorated to reflect only that component of the facilities development agreement that's related to the 20 million dollar Addison upgrade as opposed to Exhibit EMS-2, the estimated fund withdrawals there which assumes International Paper but all in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	1	THE WITNESS: It's with International
component of the facilities development agreement that's related to the 20 million dollar Addison upgrade as opposed to Exhibit EMS-2, the estimated fund withdrawals there which assumes International Paper but all in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	2	Paper, but with the facilities development
agreement that's related to the 20 million dollar Addison upgrade as opposed to Exhibit EMS-2, the estimated fund withdrawals there which assumes International Paper but all in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	3	agreement prorated to reflect only that
dollar Addison upgrade as opposed to Exhibit EMS-2, the estimated fund withdrawals there which assumes International Paper but all in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	4	component of the facilities development
EMS-2, the estimated fund withdrawals there which assumes International Paper but all in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	5	agreement that's related to the 20 million
which assumes International Paper but all in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	6	dollar Addison upgrade as opposed to Exhibit
in. All of the facilities necessary to construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	7	EMS-2, the estimated fund withdrawals there
construct and serve International Paper. MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	8	which assumes International Paper but all
MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	9	in. All of the facilities necessary to
clarifications I'm seeking is well first of all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	10	construct and serve International Paper.
all, each of these attachments depict two different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	11	MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Now one of the
different scenarios; one with subsidy and one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	12	clarifications I'm seeking is well first of
one without; correct? THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	13	all, each of these attachments depict two
THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	14	different scenarios; one with subsidy and
thinking about that last night as I was reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	15	one without; correct?
reviewing these. MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	16	THE WITNESS: And subsidy, I was
MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund? THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	17	thinking about that last night as I was
THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of words. The first part of this on each exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	18	reviewing these.
21 words. The first part of this on each 22 exhibit where it says income including 23 subsidy. That's saying if the existing 24 market generated revenues, how much how 25 much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	19	MR. DUDLEY: Is that the expansion fund?
exhibit where it says income including subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	20	THE WITNESS: No. It's a poor choice of
subsidy. That's saying if the existing market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	21	words. The first part of this on each
market generated revenues, how much how much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	22	exhibit where it says income including
much adequate to cover the cost of this CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	23	subsidy. That's saying if the existing
CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	24	market generated revenues, how much how
	25	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

project, how much would that be. Maybe that should say including rate impact and existing market.

The fund doesn't play into the first two pages of either of these exhibits. This is simply looking at the Vergennes and Middlebury markets, and the facility cost, and the top says how much revenue would we have to get from those markets to cover it.

The next chunk down says how much revenue are we getting from those markets to cover it.

And the next one down is okay, what's the rate impact which is sort of the difference between one and two.

MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you for that.

Now as I look at the first section including subsidy, on both 1.1 and 1.2, and you had a discussion with Mr. Young just a little while ago about the revenue impact of International Paper. It appears that your net profit margin -- it appears that there is no effect on your net profit margin or your operating cash flow, whether International Paper is part of the picture CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

or not. And can you help me with that?

THE WITNESS: Yup.

MR. DUDLEY: In other words, the trend lines of both net profit and operating cash flow appear to be the same.

THE WITNESS: That's right. Since that top bucket, that top chunk is basically the cost of service required for those facilities, and we are really not changing the cost of the facilities with or without International Paper, both of these were done with the same facilities cost. Then the carrying costs or the total cost of service with and without International Paper is negligible.

One place that you can see a big difference though, look at the line that says purchase gas expense. You'll see in the scenario with International Paper the purchase gas expense is significantly higher than the scenario without International Paper. But purchased gas expense basically comes in and goes out. We incur it and we charge our customers for it. Leaving what's left is really the cost of service non-gas CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

the last couple of pages of attachment 1.1

use. And I'm looking at the one for 1.2. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

subsequent phase.

I do not have the actual -- the level of equity infusion in front of me. I believe that is in Mr. Keefe's testimony in a pending 108 proceeding, or I could check that and get back to the Board.

So I testified then and I will say the same here, that no, we do not expect that same level of dividend payout, at least in the near term as it pertains to this project. We are going to need -- on the contrary rather than a dividend payout we are going to need an equity infusion from Gaz Metro for this project. I do think, however, that dividend payout is a different financial analysis than whether or not a company is or a certain market is covering its carrying costs. You're looking at different financial metrics in that case.

MR. DUDLEY: So you're telling me that that has no impact.

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't say it had no impact. But I think it would be possible, speaking hypothetically, not specifically to this project, that you could have a market that is not covering its carrying costs, and CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

1	you	could	have		still	have	adequate	cash
2	for	a div	idend	pay	yout.			

I just -- I don't think they are synonymous is my only point.

MR. DUDLEY: And given the smoothing dynamic of the extension fund, expansion fund, there is no chance of those funds being used to subsidize any type of dividend payment.

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

MR. BURKE: Not to revisit 7712 too many times, you know, on a three-person Board dissent means that you couldn't get anybody else to agree with you. That's how that is defined. But one thing we did agree on you mentioned in your answers to Ms. Porter, that it was based on the fact that there had been, I think it was eight if my memory serves me, eight out of nine I think of the adjustments had all been positive for ratepayers, and that was part of the rationale; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: It was -- we were being,

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

for lack of a better word, we were being opportunistic as it pertained to the direction our rates were heading, and yes, we felt it was more palatable to forego a rate reduction than to have a rate increase at some point in the future.

MR. BURKE: The basis for that reduction and the reductions before that though was because of the alt. reg. mechanism and the alt. reg. methodology; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I actually don't agree with that characterization. The basis for the reduction was declines in the wholesale market. The Alternative Regulation Plan was a very efficient vehicle to pass those rate reductions on to customers. So I'm not sure it's a cause and effect.

I agree with the Alternative Regulation
Plan really enabled those reductions to
happen in the manner they did. But the
actual reductions themselves were driven by
decreases in the wholesale price of gas.

MR. BURKE: Okay. The wholesale price of gas drove it, but the alt. reg. plan was the methodology to put it in place; is that CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Hello.
- 2 Q. Just three areas. First is to follow up on
- 3 Board's questions regarding using the VELCO right of way.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. I just want to confirm that Vermont Gas would
- 6 be willing to use the VELCO right of way if it became
- 7 available?
- 8 A. I can't make a blanket statement because the
- 9 VELCO right of way has different construction features in
- 10 different places. We don't want to be in the VELCO right
- of way if it's in the middle of a ravine or some other,
- 12 all things being equal, if there were two identically
- 13 situated parcels of land, as it pertains to natural
- 14 resources and archeology and constructability and one was
- in the VELCO corridor and one wasn't in the VELCO
- 16 corridor, then yes, we would be more than willing to be in
- 17 the VELCO corridor.
- 18 Q. And the second area concerns the questions
- 19 regarding the opportunity to use biomethane. Do you have
- 20 those questions and responses in mind?
- 21 A. I do.
- 22 Q. Do you know what the volume of biomethane that
- 23 would be available would be?
- 24 A. I am confident I have it with me somewhere. I
- 25 do not remember it off the top of my head. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. Orders of magnitudes it's quite small.
- 2 A. It's one farm. One production. I would be
- 3 glad to come back to the Board with that number. The
- 4 initial project with the Goodrich Farm in Salisbury is not
- 5 a huge number.
- 6 Q. And Vermont Gas has not done any analysis
- 7 about how much future biomethane would be economically
- 8 feasible?
- 9 A. No. All I have is a presentation that the
- 10 biomethane developer gave us in Franklin County about the
- 11 number of cows needed, and I don't know. But I would also
- 12 say that I don't know that biomethane needs to be limited
- 13 to Vermont Gas's service territory. I mean we are talking
- 14 about pipeline-grade biomethane. If this is a viable
- 15 alternative, we may see it develop elsewhere in the
- 16 pipeline network, and it would be great to be able to buy
- 17 biomethane.
- 18 Q. And have you looked at the economic
- 19 feasibility of biomethane?
- 20 A. It is expensive.
- 21 Q. And certainly low prices for natural gas make
- 22 that less feasible?
- 23 A. I'm not sure I agree with that. I mean there
- 24 is -- that make it less feasible, you know Vermont,
- 25 Vermonters have shown a willingness to pay a premium -- CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 certain segments of the Vermont economy have shown a
- 2 willingness to pay a premium, people are buying pow cower
- 3 -- cow power today. People are installing solar.
- 4 Q. Do you know how much more expensive biomethane
- 5 is than natural gas is at the moment?
- 6 A. I don't know. We haven't finalized
- 7 discussions with the developer. It's not inexpensive, and
- 8 it's not surprising for the first one out. Part of that
- 9 also by the way relates to where this particular facility
- 10 is located. It requires seven miles of pipe to deliver
- 11 it. A biomethane facility located closer to the
- 12 distribution system say in Franklin County would have
- 13 better economics than this.
- 14 Q. And in terms of your discussion or testimony
- 15 concerning economics, those are of a general nature. You
- 16 haven't provided any analysis of that?
- 17 A. We have not.
- 18 Q. The next area just concerns energy efficiency.
- 19 You mentioned having expanding energy efficiency to I
- think 3,000 new customers is a relatively small footprint?
- 21 A. No. My point was 3,000 customers is equal to
- 22 a little bit more than two years' worth of customer
- 23 growth. So it's not like we are doubling the number of
- 24 customers.
- So order of magnitude to energy efficiency CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 program while it's a very large project in terms of
- 2 construction and load, actually dealing with the number of
- 3 customers wouldn't necessarily require a doubling or a
- 4 tripling of the energy efficiency programs.
- 5 And I also don't want to prejudge what the DRP
- 6 process in 7676 will take out.
- 7 Q. But certainly deep retrofits and
- 8 weatherizations would reduce fossil fuel use over the life
- 9 of the pipeline; correct?
- 10 A. Agreed. The other thing I didn't mention as
- 11 it pertains to our energy efficiency programs is we
- 12 currently have a piggyback arrangement with CVOEO for
- delivery of energy efficiency to low-income customers.
- 14 And we would intend to continue that in Addison County as
- 15 well.
- 16 Q. And the expansion of the efficiency within the
- 17 Vermont Gas system would -- could be used to meet the
- 18 Vermont's goal of weatherizing 80,000 homes?
- 19 A. It could.
- 20 Q. But no specific numbers in terms of an
- 21 increase to energy efficiency has been proposed as part of
- 22 this project; is that correct?
- 23 A. No. I do not want to prejudge the outcome of
- 24 the DRP process in 7676.
- MS. LEVINE: That's all. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-606/

- 1 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Somebody
- else had questions. Mr. Lougee? Mr.
- 3 Saudek?
- 4 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MR. SAUDEK:
- 6 Q. Ms. Simollardes, I believe you said you could
- 7 provide the quantity of biomethane, and I wonder whether
- 8 you will do that. And second --
- 9 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Are you making a record
- 10 request then for that?
- MR. SAUDEK: Yes.
- 12 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Is that what you would
- like? Is there any problem with that?
- 14 BY MR. SAUDEK:
- 15 O. And second, the percent as a percentage of all
- 16 the gas in your system. And also you mentioned that you
- 17 could provide its cost versus natural gas.
- 18 A. Actually I said I didn't know the cost versus
- 19 natural gas. I didn't say I could provide that.
- 20 Q. All right. In that case I'll just leave it at
- 21 the quantity. Thank you.
- 22 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Mr. Lougee?
- MR. LOUGEE: I just -- excuse me, let's
- see. I just wanted to -- earlier I forgot
- to ask you to get the Memorandum of CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 246
1	Understanding that I was questioning Ms.
2	Simollardes on admitted into the record, and
3	I would like to do that now if I may.
4	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Could you identify it
5	again please?
6	MR. LOUGEE: Exhibit ACRPS Supp.,
7	Supplemental, TB-2.
8	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
9	MS. HAYDEN: No objection.
10	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: It's admitted.
11	MR. LOUGEE: Thank you.
12	(Exhibit ACRPS Supp. TB-2 was
13	admitted into the record.)
14	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Is there any redirect?
15	MS. HAYDEN: There is no redirect. I
16	would ask to move in the exhibit Petitioner
17	Surrebuttal EMS-1 which is the map that we
18	have discussed.
19	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. Any objection?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. It's admitted.
22	(Exhibit Petitioner Supp. EMS-1 was
23	admitted into the record.)
24	MS. PORTER: Chairman Volz, I apologize.
25	I didn't realize you had gone around the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

Page 247

- 1 table. I have some questions.
- 2 MR. COEN: You have some redirect?
- 3 MS. PORTER: No.
- 4 MR. COEN: I thought that's what you
- 5 were doing.
- 6 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 7 BY MS. PORTER:
- 8 Q. As you and I discussed earlier there are no
- 9 issues pending in this Docket with respect to the
- 10 treatment of the fund?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. And I believe that you said you would seek the
- 13 Board's permission regarding the utilization of the fund
- in the context of your base rate filing?
- 15 A. That's the current thinking, that we would do
- 16 it with our 2014 base rate filing. That's the current
- 17 thinking. It would be no later than that.
- 18 Q. Okay. If either the Board or the Department
- 19 thought that it would be better or more appropriate to
- 20 have that as a stand-alone proceeding, more of a high
- 21 level not dollar-for-dollar type proceeding to look at the
- uses of the fund, would the company be amenable to that?
- 23 A. Yes.
- MS. PORTER: Thank you. That's it.
- 25 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Thank you, CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 248
1	Ms. Simollardes. Appreciate it.
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: I think we are ready for
4	Mr. Hammer.
5	MR. COEN: Mr. Hammer, do you want to
6	raise your right-hand.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CARIMOL COURS DEPORTEDS TWO
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 249

1 KRIS HAMMER

- 2 Having been duly sworn, testified
- 3 as follows:
- 4 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Go ahead.
- 5 MR. COEN: Why don't you state your name
- for the record.
- 7 THE WITNESS: Name is Kristopher Hammer.
- 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 9 BY MS. EGAN:
- 10 Q. Could you please state your occupation for the
- 11 record?
- 12 A. I'm the Stewardship Coordinator for the
- 13 Vermont Housing and Conservation Board.
- 14 Q. Do you have a document in front of you
- 15 entitled "Prefiled Direct Testimony of Kris Hammer on
- 16 behalf of Vermont Housing and Conservation Board" dated
- June 14, 2013 consisting of three pages of testimony?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
- 19 Q. Was this document prepared by you or under
- 20 your direct supervision?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Are there any corrections to this document?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. Is this testimony that you have in the
- 25 document in front of you true and accurate to the best of CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Page 250 your knowledge? 1 2 Α. Yes, it is. MS. EGAN: I would like to move 3 admission of Mr. Hammer's prefiled 5 testimony, and the witness is free to be 6 crossed. 7 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Any 8 objection to the testimony? 9 (No response.) 10 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: The testimony is 11 admitted. 12 (The Prefiled Testimony of Kris Hammer 13 was admitted into the record.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

Yes.

THE WITNESS:

MR. YOUNG: And it may actually be moot by some of the changes that we have learned about earlier today. But my question was do -- are there any concerns that the Vermont Housing and Conservation Board has about the potential impacts of the project on the Baldwin farm? I mean we had testimony from Mr. Baldwin earlier about the access road. Does that affect you at all, and are there any concerns you have?

THE WITNESS: I think, you know, we had concerns about the pipeline in general, its impact on conserved farm.

And I understand there is going to be an MOU that we have entered into with the Ag Agency and Vermont Gas and Vermont Land Trust. And we worked out a lot of those issues that we were concerned about. Impact to ag soils, there is a whole laundry list that will be entered into testimony tomorrow.

Our main concern was whether or not the pipeline would have a long-term impact on the purpose of the easement, and provided all those things that were laid out in the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

MOU are complied with, we feel like the

purposes really wouldn't be impacted. There

would be some short-term impacts borne by

the farmer because of crop loss and that

kind of thing.

MR. YOUNG: And I've read the MOU and gone through that. And this may be mooted, but we haven't actually seen what's happened. But at least at the time of the earlier testimony there was going to be an access road across the Baldwin Farm, and my question was did that have any concerns for you separate and apart from those that were laid out in the -- addressed in the MOU?

THE WITNESS: No. I mean I think there were access roads -- that there was a temporary access agreement, and there were some conditions around how that was to be treated, whether there was going to be a permanent access road, or really just be access for construction and there would be more of an easement. But the way that was laid out we didn't have concerns that weren't addressed.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. That's all the CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

	Page 254
1	questions I had. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Ms. Egan.
3	MS. EGAN: No.
4	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any redirect?
5	MS. EGAN: No.
6	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
7	Hammer. Appreciate it.
8	I think now we would like to do Mr.
9	Guilford.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

- 1 EUGENE A. GUILFORD, JR.
- 2 Having been duly sworn, testified
- 3 as follows:
- 4 MR. COEN: Please state your name for
- 5 the record.
- THE WITNESS: My name is Gene Guilford.
- 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 8 BY MR. SAUDEK:
- 9 Q. Mr. Guilford, I've given you a document
- 10 entitled "Prefiled Testimony of Eugene A. Guilford, Jr.,"
- 11 and it has a cover page plus 19 pages. Is that a true and
- 12 accurate copy of your testimony as if you were delivering
- 13 it live today?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. I also have given you four exhibits numbered
- 16 VFDA EAG-1 through 4. And ask you whether those are the
- 17 exhibits that are referred to in your testimony?
- 18 A. Yes.
- MR. SAUDEK: I move the testimony and
- the exhibits be admitted.
- 21 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
- MS. HAYDEN: No objection.
- 23 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: They are admitted.
- 24 (Exhibits marked VFDA EAG-1 through
- EAG-4 were admitted into the record.)
 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 256
1	(The Prefiled Testimony of Eugene A.
2	Guilford, Jr. was admitted into the record.)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CARTES COURT REPORTERS TWO
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

- 1 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Is the witness
- 2 available?
- 3 MR. SAUDEK: The witness is available
- 4 for cross examination.
- 5 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Ms. Hayden.
- 6 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 7 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 8 Q. Good morning or afternoon, Mr. Guilford. Do
- 9 you have with you the list of cross examination exhibits
- 10 that the Petitioner provided to your counsel?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And I have had a conversation with your
- 13 counsel regarding there are a number of cross examination
- 14 exhibits that are discovery responses that you provided,
- in particular exhibit Petitioner Cross VFDA 1 through VFDA
- 16 11. Do you see that?
- 17 A. I do.
- 18 Q. Okay. And those responses were prepared by
- 19 you or under your direct supervision?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. And those responses are true and accurate to
- the best of your knowledge and belief?
- 23 A. That is correct.
- Q. There are no corrections that you would make
- 25 to those responses?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 25
1	A. No, ma'am.
2	MS. HAYDEN: I move the admission of
3	exhibit Petitioner Cross VFDA-1 through
4	VFDA-11.
5	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
6	MR. SAUDEK: No objection.
7	MS. LEVINE: Have these been provided to
8	parties? I haven't seen your cross
9	exhibits.
10	MS. HAYDEN: I'm sorry about that,
11	Sandy. I thought they were.
12	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Do we have copies up
13	here?
14	MS. SHUFELT: Yes. Yes.
15	MS. LEVINE: I would like to look at
16	them, but in general I thought the Board had
17	directed not to accept discovery responses
18	as exhibits.
19	MS. HAYDEN: I've conferred with
20	first of all, we were trying to economize on
21	time, and I can go through the questions and
22	answers that are in the discovery. Mr.
23	Saudek and I have talked through this, and I
24	don't have any questions if the questions in
25	the discovery would be the same. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

- which are listed as Cross Exhibit 15 through
- 2 19.
- 3 MR. KREIS: Great.
- 4 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Why don't you continue.
- 5 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 6 Q. Okay. Mr. Guilford, I refer you to page 10 of
- 7 your testimony answer -- question and answer 18.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And the question asks how would you expect
- 10 this increased domestic oil supply to influence fuel oil
- 11 prices. And in your answer you refer to a Bank of
- 12 America/Merrill Lynch document that recently advised U.S.
- investors that U.S. crude oil prices could drop as low as
- 14 50 dollars a barrel within the next two years. Do you see
- 15 that?
- 16 A. I do.
- 17 O. And is the document that's been marked as
- 18 cross exhibit -- Petitioner Cross VFDA-19 the Merrill
- 19 Lynch document that you were referring to in your answer
- 20 18?
- 21 A. I believe so. Yes.
- 22 Q. Have you reviewed this document?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And this document is dated November 30;
- 25 correct?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So November 30, 2012?
- 3 A. Correct.
- 4 Q. And since November 30, 2012 -- let me refer
- 5 you actually to page nine of the -- of exhibit Cross-19.
- 6 So if you look at pages eight and nine, at the bottom of
- 7 page eight there is a caption "Surging U.S. Shale Output
- 8 Creates a Risk of 50 dollar WTI," do you see that?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. What is WTI?
- 11 A. West Texas Intermediate.
- 12 Q. Okay. And can you read for me the statement
- in the report that is -- starts on the bottom of page
- 14 eight, and I'm sorry, it's on page nine. Starting with
- 15 "Indeed we see a risk."
- 16 Let me ask you this rather than having you try
- 17 to find it. At the top of page nine it states; "Indeed we
- 18 see a risk of WTI crude oil prices temporarily dropping to
- 19 50 dollars a barrel over the next 24 months to force a
- 20 slow down in supply growth or a change in crude oil export
- 21 rules."
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Is that the statement that you relied on for
- 24 your testimony?
- 25 A. Yes. Yes.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. And did you -- are you aware that prices have
- 2 dropped to 50 dollars a barrel in the -- in the time since
- 3 November 30 when this was prepared?
- 4 A. No, they have not.
- 5 Q. Okay. And I think your answer at the end of
- 6 answer 16 you refer to on page nine, you refer to at the
- 7 very bottom lines 18 through 19. "According to the U.S.
- 8 Energy Information Administration the United States could
- 9 soon rival Saudi Arabia and the world's leading supplier
- 10 of crude oil."
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And as I understand it from reading your next
- 13 question and answer, that the purpose of that statement is
- 14 to suggest that oil prices will decrease?
- 15 A. Could. Yes.
- 16 Q. Have you had a chance to look at what's been
- 17 marked as exhibit Petitioner Cross VFDA-15, the short-term
- 18 energy outlook dated September 2013 from the U.S. Energy
- 19 Administration?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. And do you see there that the EIA is talking
- 22 about disruptions in Libya and surrounding countries
- 23 having had the effect of causing prices to increase to
- over a hundred eight dollars per barrel?
- 25 A. Yes.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 MS. HAYDEN: I have no further
- 2 questions.
- 3 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Great. Thank you.
- 4 MS. HAYDEN: I do move the admission of
- 5 exhibit Petitioner Cross VFDA-15 as well as
- 6 the document that we just discussed, the
- 7 Bank of America document, which is exhibit
- Petitioner Cross VFDA-19.
- 9 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
- 10 (No response.)
- 11 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: All right. They are
- 12 admitted.
- 13 (Exhibits marked Petitioner's Cross
- 14 VFDA-15 and Cross VFDA-19 were admitted into
- 15 the record.)
- 16 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Mr. Palmer, do you have
- 17 questions for this witness?
- 18 MR. PALMER: Just a quick question.
- 19 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 20 BY MR. PALMER:
- 21 Q. I'm just curious; is there a correlation
- 22 between the number of residential customers and the number
- of employees needed to service those customers?
- 24 A. For?
- Q. Well what I'm trying to get at is in other CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 words, for the fuel dealers is there, you know, does it
- 2 take a certain amount of fuel people to service a certain
- 3 number of customers?
- 4 A. Right. Yes.
- 5 Q. And do you know what that correlation is?
- A. Well it's going to differ by company because
- 7 there are different ways of managing it, but generally
- 8 speaking there is going to be one delivery truck for
- 9 roughly each thousand customers.
- 10 O. For each thousand customers.
- 11 A. Right.
- 12 Q. So when they lose 3,000 customers in an area,
- 13 they are going to lose at least three jobs?
- 14 A. Well that would be the least of their concern,
- but yes, they would be losing three jobs and three
- 16 delivery drivers, that's correct.
- 17 O. It could be more than that?
- 18 A. Absolutely, yes.
- 19 Q. So the increase of natural gas which is going
- 20 to produce cheaper fuel will possibly cause a loss of jobs
- 21 in the area?
- 22 A. Certainly.
- MS. HAYDEN: Mr. Chairman, one of the
- 24 conditions of the Fuel Dealers having been
- allowed to intervene in this Docket is that CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

continues in that direction -
CHAIRMAN VOLZ: All right. Do you have

more questions, Mr. Palmer?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

23

24

25

England. And in meeting with Gordon and with officials from ISO New England, the dynamic that occurs in the energy markets when, for example, when the middle of the winter during the height of an extremely cold period is that there is intense competition among existing natural gas supply for adequate natural gas for electricity generation versus adequate natural gas in order to be able to serve homes. And there have been instances over the past few years, for example, where there have been fairly significant spikes in the price of gas as utilities have to move into the physical markets and purchase additional gas in order to meet extraordinary demand that may be of a short term nature.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What he's suggesting is that -- what he stated was that the region is becoming overly reliant on gas for those purposes, and as a result that competition for the use of the gas can create problems with respect to the reliability of the delivery of the service as well as its cost on a short-term basis.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 268
1	MR. YOUNG: But your testimony seems to
2	attribute to that that to a shortage of
3	supply of natural gas generally.
4	THE WITNESS: Correct.
5	MR. YOUNG: Isn't the real problem for
6	electric generation reliance in New England
7	that nobody is willing to pay firm capacity
8	on the pipeline, so you can't get the gas
9	here when it gets cold?
10	THE WITNESS: That is indeed a
11	complicating factor that you and other
12	utility commissions like yours have to meet.
13	That's certainly true. But nonetheless with
14	regard to the narrow issue that Mr. Van
15	Wiley addressed, when he was addressing that
16	issue within the scope of both his agency's
17	view of the electric generating capacity in
18	New England and its migration away from coal
19	and oil, and to some extent even nuclear, to
20	gas, is to highlight the problem of the
21	competition for its many intended uses,
22	especially in a short-term basis.
23	MR. YOUNG: Right. But if you
24	THE WITNESS: Lends it to itself by the
25	fact that firm capacity is certainly CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

- difficult to achieve on occasions, yes.
- 2 MR. YOUNG: If you had incremental
- 3 natural gas supply or capacity on the
- 4 pipelines built in to New England that
- 5 problem would dissipate; correct?
- 6 THE WITNESS: That's correct.
- 7 MR. YOUNG: But -- okay. That's fine.
- 8 That's it. Thank you very much.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Certainly.
- 10 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Are there any follow-up
- 11 questions to Mr. Young's questions of this
- 12 witness?
- MS. HAYDEN: I have only one.
- 14 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes.
- 15 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 16 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 17 Q. Mr. Guilford, you referred to the spike in
- 18 prices in ISO New England. It's true that you don't see
- 19 that ripple effect impacting prices at Henry Hub, right?
- 20 A. That's an interesting question. Did Henry Hub
- 21 spike by the same magnitude at the same time? No, it did
- 22 not.
- 23 Q. And when you were asked the question about
- 24 whether the problem with these generators is that there is
- 25 no firm capacity, you agreed with that; correct? CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Yes, that's right.
- Q. Many of these generators are operating with
- 3 interruptible contracts; correct?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 MS. HAYDEN: Okay. I have nothing
- further.
- 7 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. You're
- 8 excused, Mr. Guilford. Thank you.
- 9 It's almost 5 o'clock. And so we are
- 10 trying to decide whether to go on to the
- 11 next witness or whether we want to break for
- the day and start tomorrow.
- 13 Did people have opinions on that?
- MS. HAYDEN: Well, you know, the only
- thing I would say about that, and I didn't
- 16 check with my client first, is that it's
- going to take a little bit of time to walk
- through his exhibits.
- 19 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Do you want to put that
- 20 on now?
- MS. HAYDEN: We can go off the record
- and talk about what we plan to do, and then
- either do that tonight or tomorrow morning.
- 24 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: You're talking about Mr.
- 25 Heintz right now?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 271
1	MS. HAYDEN: Mr. Heintz.
2	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Do you want to put his
3	testimony in and get everything in now, and
4	then we will start questioning him tomorrow
5	morning? That would be fine. Why don't we
6	at least do that.
7	MS. HAYDEN: The other thing that Ms.
8	Simollardes just mentioned is that we could
9	find out if you have questions for Mr. Howe,
10	because he stayed for the day, and he's
11	prepared to be here tomorrow as well.
12	And I don't know if you have shorter
13	number of questions for him.
14	MR. KREIS: While there is a break could
15	I just clarify I have in my hand three
16	documents that look like VFDA exhibits. And
17	as far as I know they haven't been tendered
18	for admission into the record.
19	MR. SAUDEK: I'm sorry.
20	MR. KREIS: I'm just wondering about
21	these three exhibits EAG-1, 2, 3 or 4 and
22	whether you intend to move their admission
23	into the record.
24	MR. SAUDEK: I thought I had. Yes. I
25	certainly do. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

	Page 272
1	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Is there any objection?
2	(No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Okay. They are
4	admitted.
5	(Exhibits marked EAG-1 through EAG-4
6	were admitted into the record.)
7	MR. KREIS: Thank you.
8	MR. BURKE: Thanks for catching that,
9	Don.
10	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: We have one question for
11	Mr. Howe and take it nobody else does. So
12	why don't we do him now then. Is that good?
13	MR. BURKE: Sure. Let's do it.
14	MR. YOUNG: It's not one question per
15	the John Burke rule.
16	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: It may be a line of
17	questions is what you're saying. It's a
18	line of questions. It's not one question.
19	MR. BURKE: This is Mr. Young, so it
20	might be more than that.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CADIMOI COUDE DEDODEEDS INS
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

JAMES B. HOWE

- 2 Having been duly sworn, testified
- 3 as follows:
- 4 MR. COEN: Please state your name for
- 5 the record.
- 6 THE WITNESS: My name is James Howe.
- 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 8 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 9 Q. Good morning. I keep saying good morning.
- 10 Good afternoon, Mr. Howe. I'm going to hand you --
- MR. COEN: Why don't you talk into the
- 12 mic, Kim.
- 13 BY MS. HAYDEN:
- 14 Q. Mr. Howe, I'm providing you with a copy of
- 15 your prefiled testimony and exhibits in this proceeding.
- 16 Beginning with your prefiled testimony, do you have in
- 17 front of you a document entitled "Prefiled Testimony of
- James Howe" dated December 20, 2012, consisting of 17
- 19 pages together with a cover page and an index?
- 20 A. Yes, I do.
- 21 Q. And was that document prepared by you or under
- 22 your direct supervision?
- 23 A. Yes, it was.
- Q. Is it true and accurate to the best of your
- 25 knowledge and belief?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Are there any corrections?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. And you also have what's been identified on
- 5 the index to that testimony exhibits JHB-1 through 3?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And those documents were prepared by you or
- 8 under your direct supervision?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Are they true and accurate to the best of your
- 11 knowledge and belief?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Are there any corrections that you need to
- 14 make?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Do you also have in front of you rebuttal
- 17 prefiled testimony of James Howe dated June 28, 2013
- 18 consisting of eight pages together with a cover page and
- 19 an index?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Was that document prepared by you or under
- 22 your direct supervision?
- 23 A. Yes, it was.
- Q. Is it true and accurate to the best of your
- 25 knowledge and belief?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 O. And are there no corrections to make to that?
- 3 A. No. There are not.
- 4 Q. With your rebuttal testimony there was one
- 5 rebuttal exhibit included. Exhibit Petitioner Rebuttal
- 6 JBH-1. Was this document collected by you? It's entitled
- 7 "PHMSA Comparison of Risk."
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And can you just state for the Board what
- 10 PHMSA stands for?
- 11 A. PHMSA, Pipeline Hazardous Material Safety
- 12 Administration, it's a part of the U.S. Department of
- 13 Transportation.
- MS. HAYDEN: Thank you. With that, I
- move the admission of the prefiled and
- 16 rebuttal prefiled testimony and exhibits of
- James Howe.
- 18 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Any objection?
- 19 (No response.)
- 20 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: They are admitted.
- 21 (Exhibits marked JBH-1 through JBH-3 and
- 22 Petitioner Rebuttal JBH-1 were admitted
- into the record.)
- 24 (The Prefiled Testimony of James B. Howe
- 25 was admitted into the record.)
 CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

Potential Impact Radius, it was referenced

25

-- one of the speakers at the public hearing 1 expressed concern about the potential 3 effects of a pipeline and treatment of the Potential Impact Radius.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Can you explain to me what that is and whether that should be a concern to the Board?

THE WITNESS: Sure. So I think I need to explain sort of in the context of how pipelines are designed and how PIR factors into that. So I'll start with kind of the basics.

So you have a steel pipe, and one of the main factors in the strength of the pipe, each particular type of pipe diameter, thickness and so forth has what we call SMYS, S-M-Y-S, which is specified minimum yield strength. It's the point at which the pipe let's go.

Okay. So in doing the design based on the federal regulations that PHMSA has in place that govern the pipeline industry in the United States, there is a process that you go through to determine the safety factors that are used in that design.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

So you start with the determination of what we call the high consequence area. So to determine a high consequence area you basically take a mile segment along the pipe, and you look 660 feet on either side, and you determine the number of buildings that are -- would be used for inhabiting -- inhabited by people in that block, and that determines the class location. So if it's less than 10, it's called class one. If it's between 10 and so forth, class two. Above 46 or above is class three, and class four is an area that predominantly has buildings more than four stories high.

So you determine the class location. So if it's class three or four it's considered a high consequence area. In addition, if it's class one or class two, you look at what's called Potential Impact Radius.

Potential Impact Radius is a formula that you use based on the pressure and the diameter of the pipe. It determines if the pipe were to fail and the worst case scenario what the radius of the impact would be from that event.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

If there are within that diameter any place along the pipeline in the class one or class two location, if there are 20 or more buildings that are intended for inhabiting by people, that then in a class one or class two, would also be considered a high consequence area.

So once you know what a high consequence area is, and you know that class location, that defined, that dictates the safety factors that are used in the design and construction from two perspectives. One, depending on the class location it determines what percentage of SMYS, specified minimum yield strength, you can design to. So if it's class one you can design up to 72 percent of SMYS. If it's class two, it's 60 percent. If it's class three it's 50 percent. If it's class four it's 40 percent. So if it's class three, you're designing to basically half of the ultimate strength of the pipe.

The second thing that it impacts is when you do the construction you have to do a strength test of the pipe before you put it CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

in service, basically a hydro test. The pipe is built, you fill it with water, you pump it up to a certain pressure to make sure that there are no construction issues or manufacturing defects that would impact the strength of the pipe.

For class one and two, you pressure test up to 1.25 times, one and a quarter times the maximum pressure that you would potentially operate at. For class three and four it's one and-a-half times. So that's a factor of -- safety factor that's built into the process as well. So the PIR is a part of the process of determining how you apply safety factors to the design and verification of -- post construction of the strength of the pipe.

MR. YOUNG: May I presume from the fact that VGS has elected to put in class -- to meet class three standards for the pipe that the company has taken into account the types of testing that the PIR would be designed to trigger?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: Bad phrasing. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

1	THE WITNESS: Going to a class three
2	across the board for the whole pipe is
3	definitely a conservative design on the part
4	of Vermont Gas. From my perspective it's
5	also sort of ahead of the game of where the
6	federal regulations may be going. There is
7	discussion at the federal level to eliminate
8	class locations as a part of the determining
9	factor and basically to go to one class
10	location that would be considered
11	everything would be considered HCA. So the
12	fact that Vermont Gas is going to this level
13	of design will actually be ahead of what
14	possibly could end up being revisions in the
15	regulations over the next two or three
16	years.
17	MR. YOUNG: The outcome is what I'm
18	taking from this is that the decision to go
19	to class three pipe standards throughout
20	essentially means the commenter's concern
21	that they raised at the hearing has been
22	addressed.
23	THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe so.
24	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next area is actually
25	in your testimony, page seven of your CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

rebuttal testimony please. And here you're responding to Mr. Friedman's testimony.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: In here you dismiss Mr. Friedman's concerns and said you're not aware of the Rhodes article, and then you also say it appears to address the Canadian system. Is there any reason the Canadian system would be designed with larger setbacks or in different ways than the U.S. system?

THE WITNESS: I don't believe so. When I saw this particular -- Mr. Friedman's information, I found Mr. Rhodes' article, I read it. I don't know that it is a standard that has been applied in Canada. I noticed that it was -- that's from Canada, and it was -- seemed to be at least from the way I read it -- seemed to talk about Canadian applications.

My only perspective was I'm not aware of any regulation or requirement in the United States that applies to any kind of setback requirement; that really the design and testing process that I described is intended CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

863-6067

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802)

25

BY MR. PALMER:

- 1 Q. What is the impact radius that you feel is
- 2 safe on this particular pipeline design?
- 3 A. The PIR factors into the design criteria. And
- 4 my calculation of the Potential Impact Radius at the
- 5 design pressure of the pipeline which is 1,440 is 300
- 6 feet. At the operating pressure that will be in place, my
- 7 understanding is the pipe is going to operate at between
- 8 580 and 600 as it's been proposed at this point in time.
- 9 That impact radius is about 200. Actually 1,440 I think
- 10 it's 320 or 330, something plus or minus.
- 11 So that impact radius has been utilized to
- 12 determine the safety factors that are applied to the
- design which from a regulatory perspective makes the
- 14 design at the safety level that is expected from a federal
- 15 regulation standpoint.
- 16 Q. So that 120 feet is definitely inside the
- 17 impact zone.
- 18 A. Yes, it is.
- MR. PALMER: Thank you.
- 20 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. Mr. Howe --
- 21 redirect?
- MS. HAYDEN: There was just one
- clarification.
- 24 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 25 BY MS. HAYDEN:

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

- 1 Q. Mr. Howe, are you recommending a 300-foot
- 2 setback based on the Potential Impact Radius?
- A. No, I'm not.
- 4 Q. One other clarification. Earlier at least in
- 5 my notes, you were referring to class one, two, three and
- 6 four, and I thought I heard you say that class one and two
- 7 are the more conservative. Did I mishear that? Is it --
- 8 because Vermont Gas has agreed to design its pipe to a
- 9 class three design.
- 10 A. No, the class -- so class one, two, three
- 11 four, describes the area that the pipe is going through,
- 12 so the more conservative design is as you go farther. So
- 13 as you go to three and four that is more conservative
- 14 design than for one and two. What one and two would be if
- 15 you designed to that level of class location.
- 16 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. You're
- 17 excused. Thank you.
- Okay. We are done for today. Yes.
- 19 MR. PETERSON: The Board has indicated
- 20 Mr. Miller's presence will not be required.
- 21 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: That's correct.
- MR. PETERSON: We do have an affidavit
- from Mr. Miller attesting to his prefiled
- testimony, which I would be happy read into
- 25 the record with that testimony. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

	Page 287
1	MR. PETERSON: Okay. I offer others an
2	opportunity
3	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: You haven't handed that
4	out. No one's seen it yet.
5	MR. PETERSON: No.
6	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: What it attests to is
7	the truthfulness and accuracy of the
8	testimony and exhibits.
9	MR. PETERSON: Exactly.
10	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Is there any objection
11	to the affidavit and testimony and exhibits
12	of Mr. Miller?
13	MS. HAYDEN: No objection.
14	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Thank you. I appreciate
15	you bringing this up. It's out of the way.
16	Admitted.
17	(Exhibits of Tyler Miller and his
18	Affidavit were admitted into the record.)
19	(The Prefiled Testimony of Tyler Miller
20	was admitted into the record.)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CADIMOI COUDE DEPONERDO INC
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067

1 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: We are going to meet 2 tomorrow morning before the hearings start 3 at 8:30. Hearings will start at 9:30. 4 MR. PALMER: Do we have a schedule of 5 witnesses for tomorrow? 6 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. It was I 7 believe it was circulated on August 28. 8 MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as 9 yesterday except we are going to be starting 10 with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we 11 haven't heard any other changes the parties 12 proposed to the rest of the order of 13 witnesses for tomorrow. 14 MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested 15 16 MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind 17 gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to 18 play with us, so he will be rescheduled for 19 later in the week. 20 MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, 21 Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. 22 VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be 23 there for the jury selection. He also 24 wanted to make it clear he was not being 25 there on his own personal accord in court. 26 CAURT REPORTERS, INC. 27 1800/802/3 863-6667		Page 28
at 8:30. Hearings will start at 9:30. MR. PALMER: Do we have a schedule of witnesses for tomorrow? CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. It was I believe it was circulated on August 28. MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as yesterday except we are going to be starting with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we haven't heard any other changes the parties proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	1	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: We are going to meet
MR. PALMER: Do we have a schedule of witnesses for tomorrow? CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. It was I believe it was circulated on August 28. MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as yesterday except we are going to be starting with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we haven't heard any other changes the parties proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	2	tomorrow morning before the hearings start
CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. It was I CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. It was I believe it was circulated on August 28. MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as yesterday except we are going to be starting with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we haven't heard any other changes the parties proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	3	at 8:30. Hearings will start at 9:30.
6 CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. It was I 7 believe it was circulated on August 28. 8 MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as 9 yesterday except we are going to be starting 10 with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we 11 haven't heard any other changes the parties 12 proposed to the rest of the order of 13 witnesses for tomorrow. 14 MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested 15 16 MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind 17 gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to 18 play with us, so he will be rescheduled for 19 later in the week. 20 MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, 21 Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. 22 VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be 23 there for the jury selection. He also 24 wanted to make it clear he was not being 25 there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	4	MR. PALMER: Do we have a schedule of
MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as yesterday except we are going to be starting with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we haven't heard any other changes the parties proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	5	witnesses for tomorrow?
MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as 9 yesterday except we are going to be starting 10 with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we 11 haven't heard any other changes the parties 12 proposed to the rest of the order of 13 witnesses for tomorrow. 14 MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested 15 16 MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind 17 gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to 18 play with us, so he will be rescheduled for 19 later in the week. 20 MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, 21 Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. 22 VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be 23 there for the jury selection. He also 24 wanted to make it clear he was not being 25 there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	6	CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Yes. It was I
yesterday except we are going to be starting with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we haven't heard any other changes the parties proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	7	believe it was circulated on August 28.
with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we haven't heard any other changes the parties proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	8	MR. YOUNG: It's the same schedule as
haven't heard any other changes the parties proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	9	yesterday except we are going to be starting
proposed to the rest of the order of witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	10	with Mr. Heintz and Mr. Teixeira, and we
witnesses for tomorrow. MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	11	haven't heard any other changes the parties
MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	12	proposed to the rest of the order of
15 16 MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind 17 gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to 18 play with us, so he will be rescheduled for 19 later in the week. 20 MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, 21 Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. 22 VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be 23 there for the jury selection. He also 24 wanted to make it clear he was not being 25 there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	13	witnesses for tomorrow.
MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	14	MS. PORTER: Mr. Young, I had requested
gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	15	
play with us, so he will be rescheduled for later in the week. MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	16	MR. YOUNG: I take it back. Peter Lind
19 later in the week. 20 MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, 21 Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. 22 VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be 23 there for the jury selection. He also 24 wanted to make it clear he was not being 25 there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	17	gets to go do jury duty instead of coming to
MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear, Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	18	play with us, so he will be rescheduled for
Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty. VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	19	later in the week.
VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	20	MR. SCIARROTTA: So the record is clear,
there for the jury selection. He also wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	21	Mr. Lind is not reporting for jury duty.
wanted to make it clear he was not being there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	22	VELCO is picking a jury, and he needs to be
there on his own personal accord in court. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	23	there for the jury selection. He also
CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.	24	wanted to make it clear he was not being
(000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,00	25	-

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: We hadn't decided on -there are a total of 12 witnesses that the
parties didn't have questions for, and we
are still sorting out. I guess some of them
we have just talked about.

MR. YOUNG: In your case I did raise it with the Board and was informed that the Board may have questions from Mr. Pcolar on behalf of Agri-Mark, so we will need him whenever we can fit him in the schedule.

And we will take all that stuff up tomorrow morning and figure out where everybody goes.

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: The parties may want to stay back and talk a little bit now about when you want to schedule these witnesses so you'll be ready to present something tomorrow morning, proposal for how to work them into the schedule.

Anything else we need to take up now?

Okay. We will see you tomorrow. Thank you.

MS. DILLON: I'm sorry. I'm wondering if it might be efficient to meet briefly with Board staff for about five or 10 minutes.

CHAIRMAN VOLZ: Right now? That's fine. CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

(800/802) 863-6067

,		Page	292
1	That makes sense.		
2	(Whereupon, the proceeding was		
3	adjourned at 5:10 p.m.)		
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	CADIMOI COUDE DEDODEEDS INS		
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067		

	rage 293
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Kim U. Sears, do hereby certify that I
4	recorded by stenographic means the Technical Hearing re:
5	Docket Number 7970 at the Montpelier Room, Capitol Plaza
6	Hotel, 100 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont, on September
7	16, 2013, beginning at 9:30 a.m.
8	I further certify that the foregoing
9	testimony was taken by me stenographically and thereafter
10	reduced to typewriting and the foregoing 293 pages are a
11	transcript of the stenograph notes taken by me of the
12	evidence and the proceedings to the best of my ability.
13	I further certify that I am not related to
14	any of the parties thereto or their counsel, and I am in
15	no way interested in the outcome of said cause.
16	Dated at Williston, Vermont, this 17th day
17	of September, 2013.
18	
19	Kim U. Sears, RPR
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	CADITOI COMPT DEDODTEDE TAG
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

,		Page	294
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (800/802) 863-6067		